

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL

FEBRUARY, 1925

NUMBER 2

MEDIEVAL ICONOGRAPHY AND THE QUESTION OF ARTHURIAN ORIGINS.

Classic philologists have traditionally paid to classical archaeology the tribute of serious consideration and study. Every competent student of Homer or of Pindar has known his Mycenaean excavations or his Greek vases as well as his texts. But it has been a singular fate of medieval studies in literature that they have been almost totally divorced from studies in archaeology. The doctor of philosophy is expected to know the word for 'shield' in Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Old French, Italian, Middle English, and what not. But who expects of him any exact knowledge of what a shield looked like at any given period or in any country? What classicist but knows the so-called Ludovisi throne or the frieze of the Parthenon? How many medieval philologists know the sculptures and stained glass of Chartres and the mosaics of St. Mark's and Monreale?

The year 1923 saw the publication of the medieval sections of two illustrated histories of French literature, one under the editorship of M. Bédier, the other of M. Lanson. Both are undertakings whose value I am the last to underestimate. Better than any previous undertakings of the kind, they furnish the student of the romances, chronicles, saints' lives, lyrics, and *chansons de geste* with material for the visual imagination to work upon. Here one may see, if not individual portraits of certain authors, at least the vivid portrayal of ideal author types. Here is Tintagel whose surge-beaten crags and broken battlements are haunted forever by the spirit of Romance. Here is the tower of Meung where Villon gnawed his fingers; here are the walls of Constantinople and of Tripoli which the "Franks" stormed more than once for love of Holy Sepulchre and in the hope of loot; here are the shrines of

Vézelay and Roncevaux and Meaux round which sprang up those clanging epics of Charlemagne and his peers. Here are scenes of legend, history, and drama as they lived in the dreams of their authors. Books such as these are as essential to the complete appreciation of medieval literature as are reproductions of Greek marbles and Roman triumphal arches to the complete appreciation of the ancient classics.

Yet the volumes of M. Bédier and M. Lanson, especially the latter, betray the lack of scholarly attention, not to speak of the supercilious carelessness, which is apt to characterise the attitude of the philologist toward medieval archaeology. M. Lanson is the chief offender. On p. 5 the transcript of the Oaths of Strasbourg is full of misreadings. On p. 23 we see two figures labeled "Roland et Olivier," but the rest of the caption tells us that they are the twins of the zodiac and not Roland and Oliver at all. On p. 34, we find a lady and a gentleman playing chess; that is all. The scene is one found frequently on ivories together with other courtly amusements. There is not the slightest basis for identifying these persons as Huon of Bordeaux and the daughter of the emir Sarraasini! On the next page the statement that the Davanzati frescoes are accompanied by "vers italiens" is incorrect. On p. 37 there is a tangle of errors. The picture reproduces a mosaic at Otranto. The sculpture which has been confused with it is not on the Doges' palace but on St. Mark's, Venice. The scenes from an ivory on p. 40 were identified by me in *Art in America*, v, 19 (1916). On the left Enyas rescues a damsel from an *homme sauvage* (cf. *Modern Philology*, xiv, 75 (1917)). On the right Galahad is admitted to the Castle of the Maidens. This panel and the others reproduced on pp. 40 and 41 belong to a casket in the Metropolitan Museum, New York. On p. 48 the mosaic referred to as destroyed still exists. Many of these errors would have been avoided by merely submitting the MS. to a competent archaeologist for control.

There is also a matter of taste to be criticised. It seems unfortunate that so many works of the twelfth or thirteenth century are illustrated by fifteenth century illuminations. There is not the excuse that thirteenth century art was inferior; quite the contrary. Besides, a fifteenth century illustration of a *chanson de geste* seems almost as incongruous as a Roman general clad "cap-a-pie" in a suit of Gothic armor.

M. Bédier's volume is far less open to criticism on this score, but the illumination on p. 43 of the vision of the Grail is a ridiculous piece of inane posturing, as remote from the simple grace of the thirteenth century as could be. Let us be thankful that in the reproductions from the Yates Thompson MS. M. Bédier has made ample amends for this singular lapse of taste. It seems, moreover, unfortunate that when the romance of Tristram was more frequently illustrated than any other in medieval decorative art, the one illustration given by M. Bédier of this romance, which he has himself so beautifully interpreted and powerfully vitalized, should be one of the crudest of the many ivories which depict the tryst beneath the tree.

The most serious defect in the book is the treatment of the famous Arthurian sculpture at Modena, illustrated opposite p. 18. In the first place, the names are wrongly given in the accompanying text. Galvagin should read Galvagnus; Galvarium, Galvariun; Durmaltus, Burmaltus; Caradoc, Carrado. What should we think of a scholar who copied a text with such carelessness? On p. 18 one reads: "La date où ont été exécutées les figures de la cathédrale de Modène est mal définie, et si certains archéologues la reculent jusqu'à l'année 1130, il est infiniment plus probable qu'il faut l'avancer jusqu'à l'année 1180." Here again appears that contempt for archaeology as a science which seems to characterise the medieval philologist. M. Faral, to whom I believe this remark is to be credited, feels justified in sweeping aside the great bulk of archaeological opinion on an archaeological matter simply because it does not fit in with his own theory that almost all Arthurian romance derives from Geoffrey of Monmouth. To be sure, M. Mâle has lately given his sanction to the date 1160 for this sculpture, but he has not offered the slightest evidence for his opinion, and it has not been accepted, to my knowledge, by any other archaeologist. Professors Bertoni and Toesca in Italy and Professors Porter and Morey in America, representing the highest expert opinion there is on the subject, concur in ascribing the sculpture to the early twelfth century. Professor Porter has done more; he has brought together a body of evidence of the strongest kind showing that this sculpture was done between 1099 and 1106. (Cf. A. K. Porter, *Lombard Architecture*, (1916) I, 269; II, 386; III, 44.) In an article to appear in *Medieval Studies in Memory of*

Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis, I have made some additional contributions to this evidence. The date 1099-1106 may be regarded as established. It will also be shown that the Modena sculptor heard the story in Bari from a *conteur* in the train of Breton Crusaders who spent there four months of the winter of 1096-7. The subject of the sculpture has likewise been discovered, viz., an early version of the Melwas-Medrot abduction of Guinevere, with Gawain as chief rescuer. The far-reaching implications of this discovery are to be worked out in a book which will tend to corroborate the theories of the Celtists and to explode the theories of Foerster. Naturally, when M. Faral says that "Dans la mesure où ceux-ci [la plupart des romans dits bretons] doivent quelque chose à une autre source que la seule imagination de leurs auteurs, ce n'est pas à des poèmes celtiques qu'ils se rattachent; c'est à une oeuvre de clerc," Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain*, he makes himself a pitiful figure. It is after all a just retribution for his high-handed methods of dealing with archaeological evidence that happened to be distasteful to him. But it is unfortunate that a work issued under such eminent auspices should give currency to utterly erroneous ideas concerning the Celtic foundations of Arthurian romance.

While correcting others I do not wish to spare myself. In my article in the *Romanic Review* (VIII, 196-209, 1917,) I declared (p. 205) that the Perceval casket at the Louvre was based on Crestien's *Perceval*. At the time Prof. A. C. L. Brown called my attention to the fact that the ivory carver represented Perceval as carrying two javelins instead of one, and that in this he seemed to be following a familiar Celtic practice. I did not then take the suggestion as seriously as it deserved, but the piling up of evidence by Miss Weston, Prof. Brown, Miss Williams, Dr. Griffith, M. Piquet, and others, to the effect that again and again supposed derivatives from Crestien's poems agreed among themselves as against Crestien, has brought the matter up once more. And I found that not only in this particular but also in another, the ivory casket clearly follows a more primitive tradition than that of Crestien.

In figure 6 Perceval appears carrying a bow, thus agreeing with Wolfram against Crestien. In figures 7 and 8 he carries two javelins. M. J. Loth pointed out long since that this was an ancient Celtic practice which has come down in the Irish and Welsh

legends (*Rev. Celt.*, xxviii, 1907, 67). It is preserved in the Italian *Carduino*, long recognized as an analogue to the Perceval and Guiglain stories (*I Cantari di Carduino*, in *Poemetti Cavallereschi*, 1873, ed. Rajna, 5-7). Thus the casket agrees with the ancient Celtic tradition and with a cognate to the Perceval story in assigning two javelins to the hero as against Crestien, who gives him only one.

The other and perhaps more striking detail in which this casket departs from Crestien is the number of knights seen by Perceval in the forest. In Figure 6 only three appear. Crestien (l. 1315) mentions five. Now as Professor Brown, in an article in *Modern Philology*, xvi, 554 f. (1919) pointed out, *Sir Percyvella*, Wolfram's *Parzifal*, and *Peredur* agree on the number three. The casket also depicts three. What conclusion should we draw? The casket does not in general correspond to any of these other versions, nor could it have followed any version greatly differing from Crestien. Obviously, therefore, there existed a full version of the Perceval story very close to Crestien but containing features more primitive than Crestien. Crestien himself says that Count Philip has bidden him "rimoier le meillor conte . . . Qui soit contez an cort real; Ce est li contes del graal, Don li cuens li baille le livre." All the credit which Crestien claims for himself is that of turning into rhyme a *conte* which had been transcribed. This statement is definitely confirmed by the Louvre casket, since it shows that he followed closely a story similar to that used by the ivory carver, but yet not the same.

This and a multitude of other facts have convinced me that there were hundreds of versions of Arthurian legends, current before Crestien's time and after, which have not survived. I have therefore reconsidered my adhesion to the explanation of the Arthurian scenes on a certain type of ivory casket put forward by Antoniewicz in *Romanische Forschungen*, v, 241 (1890). Of course, the old identification of Tristan and Isolt beneath the tree holds good, and so, I believe, does my own identification of Galahad's arrival at the Castle of the Maidens, published in *Art in America*, v, 22 (1916). But I am doubtful whether the four scenes on the back, which Antoniewicz held to illustrate Crestien's *Lancelot* and *Perceval*, are not really based on some forgotten romance. First we have a knight cleaving the paws from a lion, which has fixed its claws in

the knight's shield; then we have the Sword Bridge; then the Perilous Bed; then the damsels who welcome the knight after the Perilous Bed adventure. Now in the *Lancelot* no lion combat precedes the crossing of the Sword Bridge; and in the *Perceval* a lion combat should intervene between the Perilous Bed episode and the welcome of the damsels. Antoniewicz believed that through some confusion in the model from which these caskets were copied, the lion combat had been misplaced. But since there is no other sign of such carelessness on the part of the designer and since we have already seen the possibility that other texts similar to Crestien's may have been used in these ivories, it seems more probable that the order of the incidents on the casket is due not to a carver's blunder, but to some literary source other than Crestien.

The archæological evidence, we see, corroborates the view that there was a vast quantity of Arthurian tradition afloat before Geoffrey and Crestien. Probably scholars who have only a superficial acquaintance with Celtic legend will continue to deny its affinity with French romance, and there will be others who will never be convinced that Crestien is not the source of *x* and *y* even though *x* and *y* agree against Crestien fifty times instead of five. But let them not think that they have any support in Iconography, for Iconography is a Celtist.

Columbia University.

ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS.

Mr. Loomis shows above that the Paris Casket refers to an older and more archaic *Perceval* story—doubtless to the source of Crestien's romance. This iconographic evidence is rendered complete by the fact that even an illustrator of Crestien's romance did not follow Crestien's text. A miniature in the Mons MS. of *Perceval* shows the hero carrying two short spears as on the Paris casket. What possible explanation of the two spears in this miniature can there be except the survival here of an older feature that rested upon Celtic practice?

Rotographs of certain pages of the Mons MS. have been procured at my request by the kindness of a committee of the Modern Language Association, and are at the Library of Congress. This miniature of *Perceval* carrying two javelins may be found on page 15, at the beginning of Crestien's part of the romance.

Northwestern University.

ARTHUR C. L. BROWN.

A SOURCE OF SALAMMBÔ

In the notes of the Conard edition of *Salammbô*, Mr. Abrami states that all the events of the terrific struggle between Carthage and the Barbarians are given in Polybius "Tout, sauf d'abord l'amour de Mathô pour Salammbô, c'est-à-dire précisément la raison d'être du livre."¹ As the development, in Flaubert's mind, of this fictitious part of the plot remained, then, still to be sought, the previous work of Flaubert has been examined with the hope of identifying some of the factors which have made possible the final creation of the story of Salammbô and Mathô. The part of *Anubis*, for example—that former project of Flaubert's literary imagination—in the formation of *Salammbô*, has been considered by Mr. Bertrand and by Mr. Blossom, and, most recently, by Mr. Benedetto.² An indication of the basis of the *Anubis* story is given in the correspondence of Flaubert of 1850,³ but this sketch was not developed. However, Flaubert's intention to write of a woman who loved a god is not wholly abandoned, whatever differences the final form may show when compared to his original plan, for surely the central idea of an aspiration of human love for the divine has been incorporated into *Salammbô*. On the other hand, earlier critics mention a different parallel for a portion of the personal side of the novel, and the Goncourts suggest a Biblical source for a part of Flaubert's conception when they write:

Je lis une traduction nouvelle de la Bible. C'est vraiment curieux la parenté du récit de Judith, allant trouver Holopherne, avec le récit de Salammbô, se rendant au camp de Mâtho.⁴

¹ *Salammbô*, Ed. Conard, 1910, pp. 416-417.

² L. Bertrand, *Gustave Flaubert*, 1912, p. 88; F. A. Blossom, *La Composition de Salammbô*, Elliot Monographs, No. 3, 1914, p. 52; L. F. Benedetto, *Le Origini di Salammbô*, 1920, p. 64.

³ *Correspondance*, Ed. Conard, 1910, II, 12:—"A propos de sujets, j'en ai trois qui ne sont peut-être que le même, et ça m'embête considérablement. I. *Une Nuit de Don Juan* à laquelle j'ai pensé au lazaret de Rhodes. II. L'Histoire d'Anubis, la femme qui veut se faire aimer par le Dieu. . . . Ce qui me turlupine, c'est la parenté d'idées entre ces trois plans: Dans le premier, l'amour inassouissable sous les deux formes de l'amour terrestre et de l'amour mystique. Dans le second, même histoire, mais on se donne et l'amour terrestre est moins élevé en ce qu'il est plus précis. . . ."

⁴ E. & J. Goncourt, *Journal*, 1879, VI, 87.

It is to be noted that Théophile Gautier, in the criticism of *Salammbô* written soon after its publication, had already called attention to this resemblance:

Salammbô, conseillée par Schahabarim, son directeur spirituel, essaye d'aller reprendre le voile de Tanit sous la tente de Mâtho, comme une autre Judith chez un autre Holopherne, et elle y réussit aux mêmes conditions, sans couper la tête du Libyen, il est vrai.⁵

Can one, then, in addition to a revival of Flaubert's interest in the woman who loves a god, expect to discover in this novel the revealing of another preoccupation of Flaubert—the absorption in the Bible of which he spoke so frequently in his letters? It is interesting in this connection to examine the prevalence of the Biblical tale in contemporary artistic and literary surroundings. It may be noted, for example, that the appearance of Hebbel's *Judith* which had quickly made the author known throughout Germany, nearly coincided with that of an opera on the same subject by Madame Emile de Girardin. Her *Judith* was acted in Paris about the first of May, 1843, and two criticisms of it by Gautier, who was then Flaubert's master as he was later his friend, are of special interest. The second of Gautier's articles appeared in *L'Artiste* on May 10, 1857, and in it Gautier analyzed Madame de Girardin's *Judith* as follows:

Puis vinrent *Judith*, la meurtrière biblique, et Cléopâtre; Made-moiselle Rachel servit d'interprète à ces deux créations. *Judith* réussit faiblement, malgré des vers très purs et une idée ingénieuse,—celle d'avoir supposé à l'héroïne juive un vague amour pour le général assyrien qu'elle a mission d'assassiner. . . .⁶

It is also to be noted that, according to Mr. Balde,⁷ this "ingenious idea" of a vague love on the part of Judith for Holophernes (a love which finds its parallel in the story of Salammbô and Mathô) was to be found in the criticisms of Voltaire and Bayle of the Bible story, together with interpretations of Judith's visit to

⁵ Th. Gautier, *Salammbô*, 22 décembre 1862, *L'Orient*, Ed. Charpentier, 1884, p. 312.

⁶ Th. Gautier, *Galerie du XIXe Siècle: Madame Emile de Girardin*, in *L'Artiste*, May 10th, 1857.

⁷ J. Balde, *Madame de Girardin*, 1913, p. 254.

the tent of Holophernes which may well be compared to the interpretations by contemporary critics of "Sous la tente."

The earlier criticism of Gautier is his compte-rendu for the first performance of Madame de Girardin's *Judith*, and its main interest lies in references to paintings of the same subjects:

Elle (Madame de Girardin) a cru que ce serait pour l'actrice comme une espèce d'épopée nationale, et que celle-ci aurait plus de cœur à tuer Holopherne avec le grand damas que lui prêtent Raphael, Allori et Paul Véronèse que toute autre actrice chrétienne. . . . Le Costume du troisième acte est tout simplement de Raphael. . . .⁸

Later, one finds a reference by Gautier to the Judith of Horace Vernet, which was made use of for a "tableau vivant, à cadre," at the opéra.⁹

This evidence of contemporary preoccupation with the subject of Judith gives an indication of the impression which Flaubert's knowledge of it would be likely to make on him at that time and from his writings it is possible to obtain direct evidence of this knowledge. Flaubert knew and loved the Bible; even when he was devouring the edition of Cahan, his thoughts turned with pleasure to the Vulgate, which he had read continuously for at least three years.¹⁰ He does not write directly of meditations on the theme of Judith, but when an examination is made of the *Notes de Voyages*, it is found that the subject received a great deal of consideration from him. In his trip of 1850 with Du Camp, for example, Flaubert noted and studied various renderings of the story:

Caravaggio—*Judith coupe la tête à Holopherne*.—Elle l'égorge comme un poulet, lui coupant le col avec son glaive, elle est calme et fronce seulement le sourcil de la peine qu'elle a. Judith a une robe bleue. Le sang (vrai noir, rouge brun et non pas rouge pourpre comme d'ordinaire) coule sur le matelas. Tableau très féroce et d'une vérité canaille.¹¹

Christophano Allori—*Judith tenant la tête d'Holopherne*—Une servante à côté. Admirable petite toile. . . .

⁸ Th. Gautier, *Compte-rendu de Judith*, 3 mai 1843, *l'Art dramatique en France*, 1858-59, III, 45-46.

⁹ *Ibid.*, IV, 368.

¹⁰ *Correspondance*, I, 258-259; II, 127, 153.

¹¹ *Notes de Voyages*, "Italie, Naples, Musée Borbonico, 1850," Ed. Conard, 1910, II, 192.

La Judith est bien belle, paupières épaisses, visage plein de volupté et de hardiesse.

Artemiso Lomi—*Judith égorgeant Holopherne*—C'est le même tableau qui est à Naples sous le nom du Caravaggio.¹²

Allori—*Judith tenant la tête d'Holopherne à la main*—est le même en grand que le petit qui est aux Offices.¹³

But his account of the painting of Titian, which he saw during his *Voyage en famille* of 1845 (during which, it will be recalled, he first saw the painting of Breughel which gave form to the *Tentation de Saint Antoine*) is most informative:

Judith et Holopherne (Titien)—Judith, coiffure presque Pompadour, met la tête d'Holopherne dans un sac que lui présente sa suivante, négresse. . . . Elle vient de tuer, l'effort est passé, elle est calme, tranquille. Souvenons-nous du calme de Lorenzaccio, dans la pièce d'Alfred de Musset; dans le tableau de Steuben, elle rêve, elle marche à son entreprise, elle est triste; dans celui de Vernet, elle l'exécute, elle est emportée. Quelle est de ces trois situations celle que j'aurais choisie, de ces trois femmes quelle est la plus belle? La plus jolie, comme joli, c'est celle de Steuben, celle que l'on aimerait le mieux à . . . , c'est celle de Vernet, celle que l'on admire le mieux, c'est celle de Véronèse: c'est peut-être la supérieure, en tout cas, c'est la conception la plus hardie des trois. La manière toute bête dont elle met la tête d'Holopherne dans le sac n'est pas sortie d'un artiste vulgaire qui eût voulu faire de l'inspiré, de l'animé, du mouvementé, comme au premier abord le sujet d'un tel fait semble le demander. Belle histoire que celle de Judith, et que, dans des temps plus audacieux, moi aussi, j'avais rêvé.¹⁴

In 1872, this subject was again present in his mind, when, in *Saint Antoine*, he made the Lord God of Israel speak of exploits such as Judith's as part of the history of his religion.¹⁵ Taking into consideration the contemporary interest and Flaubert's own preoccupation with the story it would not, then, be beyond proba-

¹² (II) *Ibid.*, "Florence," p. 274.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

¹⁴ *Notes de Voyages*, "Voyages en famille, Gènes, 1845." Ed. Conard, I, 25.

¹⁵ *La Tentation de Saint Antoine* (1872), Ed. Charpentier, 1890, p. 244:—"Parfumées de nard, de cinnamome et de myrrhe, avec des robes transparentes et des chaussures à talon haut, des femmes à cœur intrépide allaient égorger les capitaines. . . ."

bility to conceive of *Judith* as a basis for the very similar episode in *Salammbô*.

Such a conception seems to become quite justifiable on examination of the two stories. It is of interest to note, in the first place, that the original scenario of *Salammbô* does not contain the idea of *Anubis*, that in it the daughter of Hamilcar is not desirous of the knowledge of Tanit. Rather, her resemblance to the Biblical Judith,—with, perhaps, the addition of the trait of vague love which has already been adjoined in France,—is marked. The scenario reads:

La jeune fille prend, après mille lutttes, la résolution de sauver la ville, en reprenant le voile—elle y retouchera, elle mourra, mais Carthage sera sauvée par une femme. Elle ne met dans sa confiance que quelques serviteurs fidèles—elle part pour le camp des Mercenaires—elle entre—joie de Mâtho. . . .¹⁶

To this should be compared the emphasis in the prayers and thanksgivings which were occasioned by the expedition of Judith:

Abats leur élévation par la main d'une femme.¹⁷

Le seigneur tout-puissant les a frustrés de leurs entreprises par la main d'une femme. . . .¹⁸

Judith, fille de Mérari, l'a défait par la beauté de son visage.¹⁹

A comparison of *Judith* with *Salammbô* in its final form tends to confirm the hypothesis that a memory of the former story was present in the mind of Flaubert at the time of his conception of *Salammbô*. Each of the heroines is urged to save her country and, after consenting to the mission, makes secret preparation for the journey. *Salammbô*, like Judith, goes through preliminary religious rites and then puts on ceremonial clothing and decks herself with jewels. Special food is prepared for each journey. Judith meets the first watch of the Assyrians and tells them that she, a woman of the race of the Hebrews, has fled from them and wishes to present herself to Holophernes. *Salammbô* also is stopped by a sentinel and, as a refugee from Carthage, demands speech with Mâtho. Even the setting of the tent is similar: *Salammbô* sees

¹⁶ *Salammbô*, Ed. Conard, 1910, *Notes*, p. 469.

¹⁷ *La Sainte Bible, Livres apocryphes*, Ed. David Martin, Montauban, 1823, *Judith*, ix, 14.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, xvi, 7.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, xvi, 8.

on a bed the *zaimph*, bluish and shining; she seizes a dagger from the head of the bed and starts to kill Mâtho; in the end, she escapes with the *zaimph* from the camp of the Barbarians. Judith, in her adventure, kills Holophernes after taking his scimitar from the pillar of the bed and she, too, takes with her from the besieging camp the *pavillon* which covers the bed of Holophernes and which was woven of purple and gold and emeralds and precious stones. The results of the adventures, again, were similar, for both Judith and Salammbô were greeted in their cities by stunned silence and then by the people's acclamation, while both encampments were thrown by their success into a confusion of shouting and storm.

There is in the two stories a great similarity of details of ceremony, of apparel, etc., as well as of action. The emphasis in them is naturally different: the Biblical writer had to dwell on the beauty of Judith to account for the success of her mission, while Flaubert had already in earlier chapters justified the influence of Salammbô on Mâtho. On the other hand the extended description of the camp in *Salammbô* was necessitated by a complexity of plot, not found in the Bible story. It would seem, then, justifiable to allot to *Judith* a place among the sources of Flaubert's novel.

Millburn, N. J.

LOUISE B. DILLINGHAM.

SCHRECKE LÄUTEN

In certain Suabian regions the expression *Schrecke läuten* is used for a special ringing of the bells, usually in the afternoon or the night before Christmas, occasionally on the eve also of other high feasts, in some districts for weddings. At present it seems to mean in most places a general festal ringing of all the bells, in some places a ringing of all bells three times, or with three intervals. Various popular customs are connected with this ringing. Fischer's *Schwäbisches Wörterbuch* gives the fullest and most recent information about this use of *Schrecke*. There is however no mention there of its earliest known occurrence. This seems to be in the St. Blasien liturgical manuscript of the fourteenth century of which Gerbert has reprinted large portions in Part III of his *Monumenta Veteris Liturgiae Alemannicae*. Here is stated

(p. 226) that, after the monks have been aroused for Christmas matins, "Accensis luminibus, pulsetur scilla cum duabus parvis campanis, quae compulsatio vulgariter dicitur *Schreki*. Postea fiat compulsatio in choro tantum cum illis campanis, deinde exeant de choro Diaconi et Conversi, et maiores campanae et duo signa maxima pulsentur. Venientibus vero pueris et factis tribus orationibus duo signa pulsentur unumquodque cum duabus campanis, postea omnia, et sic fiat compulsatio in omnibus festivitibus." A second mention, under 'Quando Campanae pulsandae,' is found on page 244: "Hora matutinali eat Secretarius in dormitorium et excitet de Fratribus quos voluerit et incipiat sonare duabus parvis scillis ad matutinum: Postea fiat compulsatio ab omnibus campanis in choro, quae compulsatio dicitur terracio, quae vulgariter dicitur *Schreki*." These two passages give somewhat conflicting and apparently somewhat inaccurate statements as to what was called *Schrecke*. All evidence points to its having always had a festal significance and it seems impossible to refer it, as the first passage does, simply to the introductory ringing of two small bells. The Bavarian evidence which I shall offer will establish a probability that the St. Blasien folk applied their vernacular *Schrecke läuten* to the whole series of festal ringings, two by two and then all, which the first passage describes; it is thus also probable that the second passage is wrong in applying it to a single ringing of all the bells in the choir.

In several liturgical manuscripts of the State Library in Munich, from various Bavarian monasteries, I have come upon the expression *terrores pulsare*, an interesting Latinization of *Schrecke läuten* and an idiom not to be found in any of the dictionaries of medieval Latin. The following passage from clm. 12018, a manuscript of the Benedictine monastery of St. George at Prüfening, written probably in the second half of the fifteenth century, gives clearly the how and when of *Schrecke läuten* in that monastery: (f. 161^v) "De ceremoniis in summis festivitibus observandis. . . In priori vespera et ad nocturnos terrores pulsantur, primo cum omnibus campanis, deinde bine et bine a minoribus inchoando, itemque in fine singule¹ compulsantur campane. . . . In secundis autem vesperis fit pulsus per omnia ut in priori vespera,

¹ *Singule* here as in several places in the manuscript is used in the

terroribus demptis, exceptis tribus principalibus dominicalibus festis, videlicet nativitatis et resurrectionis et penthecostes." From this, as from several other passages in the manuscript, it is clear that in the ringing of *terrores* the bells were first rung all together, then two by two, and then again all together. We see also that *terrores* were rung at second vespers only on the three highest Dominical feasts, and that the term *terrores* was not used of the single ringing of all the bells at second vespers on the other high feasts. To be sure, the following passage shows *pulsantur terrores* used of single ringings, but only as parts of the whole complex: (f. 90^r) "In priori vespera bis pulsantur terrores cum duabus maioribus campanis, deinde omnia signa more consueta." This passage describes a slightly more elaborate ringing of *terrores* which occurred at first vespers on two feasts of special local importance, the feast of St. George, after whom the monastery was named, and the anniversary of the dedication of the monastery church. The "deinde omnia signa more consueta" means the usual *terrores*, as is more clearly expressed in the directions for the other of these two special occasions (f. 124^v).

This ringing of *terrores* at vespers and matins of certain feasts I have found mentioned also in three fifteenth-century manuscripts of the monasery of St. Emmeram in Regensburg, one of which was written in 1435, and in an Indersdorff manuscript of the year 1481. Although the usual expression in these is "pulsantur terrores cum omnibus campanis," it is practically certain that it meant in these cases also a festal complex of ringings; in the Prüfening manuscript this same abridged expression is usually found in the directions for the individual highest feasts where it is clear from the passage above that it means the usual series. In Indersdorf the prematutinal *terrores* of Easter came immediately after the so-called *Elevatio Crucis*. In publishing this ceremony some years ago Professor Karl Young, who was naturally unfamiliar with this local Latinization, was puzzled by the abbreviation *t'rores* (*Postea statim pulsantur t'rores ad matutinum*) and was unable to expand it.²

sense of *omnes*; in a practically identical description of *terrores pulsare* before matins on Easter (f. 74^v) an original *singule* has been crossed out and *omnes* written in by the same hand.

² *Transactions of Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, Vol. XVI, Part II, p. 905.

In its modern use *Schrecke läuten* is in most places limited to Christmas night or the afternoon before, and the various attempts to explain the expression, while relating it naturally to the verb *schrecken*, brings it usually into connection with some of the popular Christmas customs,—a ringing to startle or arouse the people to go to church or to hasten to the fields and bind straw about the trees, or a ringing to arouse the sleeping live stock that was fed at midnight on Christmas. Fischer says in his *Schwäb. Wb.*: “Da das Läuten in der Christnacht altbezeugt ist, ist von diesem auszugehen.” But by the evidence here presented the ringing on other high feasts is also ‘altbezeugt,’ and it does not seem to have been originally more characteristic of one feast than another.

It is noteworthy that in the Latin expression the plural *terrores* is always used. This rendering of *Schrecke* by *terrores* seems convincing evidence that *Schrecke* is, or originally was, plural, the plural of the strong masculine *Schreck* (*terror*), a plural of which Schmeller's *Bayerisches Wörterbuch* gives examples in other expressions. Fischer however gives the *Schrecke* of our idiom as a different word from *Schrecke* and as a feminine singular, from which I infer that in the modern Suabian dialects it is felt as a singular. But if in Bavarian it was originally plural, it was probably also originally plural in Suabian.³ If this is so, Fischer's derivation is in need of correction. He says it is a feminine derivative of the verb *schrecken*, expressing “das Mittel zum Schrecken,” just as *die Bicke*, Suabian for wagon-brake, is a feminine from *bicken*, to brake. Furthermore, if *Schrecke* is an older strong plural of *der Schrecke*, there would be need of revising the statement which Fischer makes under *Schreck(en)*: “Bei uns kommt man mit schw. m. Schreck(en) durch, während sonst noch st. *Schreck* und n. *Schrecken* hinzuzunehmen ist.”

NEIL C. BROOKS.

University of Illinois.

³ The Latin singular *terrario* of the St. Blasien MS. can hardly be considered significant in view of the evidence already mentioned of the author's apparently imperfect understanding of the vernacular expression.

BODMER'S BORROWINGS FROM AN ITALIAN POET

In a manner reminding one somewhat of the German poet Novalis, the Italian Thomas Ceva (1648-1737) combined a fondness and aptitude for mathematics with a genuine love and marked capacity for poetry. His neo-Latin epic *Jesus Puer*,¹ written in a Roman Catholic spirit, possesses merits both as to the idyllic and the heroic vein, which were recognized even by Lessing. This poem represents another source of Bodmer's *Noah* to be added to those which I have previously discussed.

One of the most striking pieces of epic machinery in Bodmer's *Noah* is his marvelous airship. This device, as I shall show, he borrowed, and borrowed moreover from none other than Ceva. In the *Jesus Puer* there occurs in canto three a passage where the muse is besought to tell of the hordes which have been conveyed from the remotest regions of Asia on strange ships which came sailing through the air.²

In a more important reference to this same episode we learn the following. Dissension and violence have broken out among the satanic hosts. Suddenly, to the amazement of all, there arrives, as if borne high upon the backs of black clouds, a mighty aerial fleet of innumerable larger and smaller aircraft. And this fleet, as we read, makes its successful landing in this wise:

"Illa rotis se circinat aëre magnis
Paulatim ad terras spiris ingentibus acta,"

which certainly strikes one as a remarkable poetical anticipation of a familiar twentieth century achievement. The poet devotes a portion of the passage to a brief description of the people on board

¹ The title as well as the poem itself probably inspired the suggestion which Bodmer made to Wieland that he write an epic *Der Knabe Jesus*. Mörikofer did not suspect the connection; cf. his *Die Schweizerische Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts*, p. 194-5. So far as I am aware, Bodmer's friend Klopstock, though he probably knew Ceva's poem, shows no influence from that source in his *Messias*. In this matter, I am inclined to agree with Muncker; cf. his *Über einige Vorbilder für Klopstocks Dichtungen* in the reports of the Königl. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften (1908), No. 6, p. 30 f.

² Cf. l. 324-325.

and at the same time gives us also a glimpse of the cargoes which include monstrous birds, apes, satyrs and fauns.³

Here indeed was something quite after the heart of Bodmer. For the marvelous, one may well say, he ever cherished an almost child-like fondness; or, to speak more accurately, to him the strange, the exotic, the novel represented subjects preëminently suited for poetic treatment; in fact in his theory of poetry, in which against Gottsched he valiantly and successfully championed the rights of the imagination, he assigned to such themes a distinct priority over other matters. Ceva's fleet is clearly the prototype of Bodmer's airship, and even the Italian poet's demons on board have their counterpart in the "Geister des Abgrunds" who man Bodmer's aerial warship. From the *Noah*⁴ I cite the following passage. The Giant, Andramalech, speaks:

Wohlan dann,
Lasset uns einmal versuchen, ob unsre Kräfte noch ganz sind!
Glaubet ihr mir, so wird jetzt von uns ein Kriegsschiff erbautet,
Und mit Giganten besetzt, und Wolken werden gesammelt,
Die ihm untergelegt in dem fliessenden Luftpfad es tragen;
Dann ist ein leichtes mit flatternden Schwingen die Luft zu erschüttern,
Dass wir mit vollen Segeln die Seiten des Berges erreichen.
Seine Worte gefielen. Sie flogen das Werk zu vollführen.
Und nicht lang', so stieg aus der Luft ein Kriegsschiff herunter,
Mit erhabenen Masten, mit Steuer, mit Kammern und Sälen
.
Auf dem Soller erblickte man fremde Gestalten von Kriegern
In helleuchtender Rüstung.

And then, corresponding to the *descent* of Ceva's aerial fleet, Bodmer presents a somewhat more detailed account of the *ascent* of his airship in the following words:

Jetzt hoben sich unter dem Kiel die fliessenden Wolken;
Langsam fuhren sie erstlich in einer schief schlängelnden Schnecke
.
Als es jetzt hoch in der Luft, den Seiten des steigenden Berges⁵
Eben gleich stand, so ergossen dahin sich strömend die Wolken
Breit und gerade, dann spannten die neuen ätherischen Schiffer

³ Cf. *Jesus Puer*, III, 424 ff.

⁴ Cf. the edition of 1765, p. 144 f.

⁵ Their objective point.

Alle Segel auf einmal aus, um den Wind zu empfangen,
Den in dem Rücken des Schiffes nicht gesehne Flügel erschufen.⁶

(*Noah*, p. 145)

In depicting the disastrous fate of this strange craft, however, Bodmer, as I hope to show elsewhere, turns again, as was his wont, to his indispensable Milton for further welcome suggestions.⁷ So much for the airship.

Bodmer's account of Eve's experience at the placid lake is likewise a composite being indebted both to Milton and to Ceva. The Miltonian lines in question I shall reserve for another occasion; the passage in the *Jesus Puer* is the following. Eve, when she beholds her own image in the water, at first turns to see whether this be not the reflection of someone behind her. Then, as we read:

Bis mersit furtiva manum, si forte sub undis
Altera virgo foret, stagno quae pulchra lateret.

(*Jesus Puer*, iv, 208 f.)

Of this passage the following lines represent Bodmer's imitation:

Hier sah sie in den wässernen Spiegel, da sah sie sich selber,
Streckte voll Liebe den Arm aus, ihr eigenes Bild zu ergreifen,
Aber ergriff nur Wasser, das Bild war im Wasser verloren.

(*Noah*, p. 157)

Bodmer in the *Noah* introduces a historical reminiscence of the Eve of St. Bartholomew and there represents the two contending parties as "die Blauen" and "die Grünen." In Ceva's epic we likewise read of two hostile parties, each of which uses a color as its watchword

Causa mali geminae perplexa ab origine partes,
Queis bicolor nomen fatalis tessera belli.

(*Jesus Puer*, vi, 37 f.)

Though this passage probably had a certain suggestive influence upon the Bodmerian conception, the specific colors blue and green, as party emblems, undoubtedly trace back to the occasion of the civil war in Constantinople at the time of Emperor Justinian.⁸

For the prophetic tapestries, of which we find repeated mention in the *Noah*, there were probably several contributing sources, one

⁶ That Bodmer was far from being a scientist, appears from his naive conception of a ship under sail capable of producing its own propelling wind.

⁷ The airship is also referred to in the *Noah* on pp. 170, 171, 173, and elsewhere.

⁸ A brief account of this conflict may be found on p. 102 of Bémont and

of them being Ceva's use of a similar device in his epic.⁹ As in the case of the Bodmerian tapestries on the walls of the ark, the painted scenes in the *Jesus Puer* represent future events both of secular and ecclesiastical history; of the latter we find particularly the future passion of Christ anticipated.¹⁰

Bodmer was fond of indicating lapse of time by reference to the course of the sun. Examples like the following illustrate this usage:

Heute wälzt sich die funfzigste Sonn' um die Stunden des Mittags¹¹
and again

Ehe die vierte Sonne

. . . . die Stirne der Aurora entfärbet hatte.¹²

Bodmer's contemporary Schönaich in the *Neologisches Wörterbuch*¹³ cites from the earlier edition of the *Noah*:¹⁴

Fünfzig Sonnen war Noah schon mit dem Engel abwesend

a line which provokes the following characteristic and, at the same time, revealing, comment: "Wie lange ist das? Gehet alle Jahre eine neue Sonne auf? Rath Bodmer glaubet vielleicht, wie einige Völker, dass alle Tage eine neue Sonne aufgehe." The poets have, of course, long been given to the practice of indicating the passage of time by reference to the movement of the heavenly bodies whether of the sun, the moon or the stars. This manner of measuring time, which extends back to classical usage, prevailed also during the seventeenth century renaissance where we find examples in Opitz, Ronsard and others.¹⁵ Ceva too, conformable to the practice, says, for example,

Adsum, inquit [sc. Jonas], Memphi digressus longa viarum
Post spatia, et soles terdenos.¹⁶

Monod's *Medieval Europe*, translated from the French by Mary Sloan. Baechtold in his *Deutsche Lit. der Schweiz*, p. 473, points out a similar use of colors as party designations in Gottsched's *Parisische Bluthochzeit*; this drama was not accessible to me.

⁹ Among other possible, or rather probable, sources, the tapestries in the palace at Carthage (cf. Virgil's *Aeneid*, I) may be referred to. There also come to mind the curtain and the reliefs (cf. Virgil's *Georgics*, III, 25 ff.) upon both of which are depicted future historical events. Moreover, the visions of the future which old Anchises sets before Aeneas (*Aeneid*, VI) probably had some influence upon the prophetic visions in the *Noah* as they also had upon *Paradise Lost*.

¹⁰ Cf. *Jesus Puer*, VI. ¹¹ Cf. the *Noah*, p. 17. ¹² *Ibid.*, p. 209.

¹³ Cf. p. 332.

¹⁴ Cf. the edition of 1752, I, 36.

¹⁵ Cf. Rich. Beckherrs: *Opitz, Ronsard, und Heinsius*, p. 72 f.

¹⁶ Cf. *Jesus Puer*, I, 87 f.

One point more in conclusion. Ceva's poem has its successful idyllic pictures which, like the scenes of this type in *Paradise Lost*, probably suggested and indeed helped to shape such scenes in the *Noah*; this is the more likely since Bodmer, along with his characteristic predilection for the marvelous, betrays also an unmistakable innate fondness for the idyllic both in life and in literature.

University of Iowa.

C. H. IBERSHOFF.

MR. JOHN MASEFIELD: A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

About a year ago, having in hand the writing of a short sketch of Mr. John Masefield's work for an anthology, I met unexpected difficulty in ascertaining definitely the simplest facts about his life. Without appending a list of all the errors and inconsistencies which I found in books of reference,¹ I will merely record that the date of Mr. Masefield's birth was variously given as 1874, 1875, and 1878; the place as Shropshire, Ledbury in Herefordshire, and "the west of England"; the scenery of his earlier poetry as Shropshire, Gloucestershire, and Herefordshire; and, in a number of books, the date of his coming to America as 1902—at variance with his own declaration.²

In a strain, rather unusual in him, of mildly humorous self-consciousness, Mr. Masefield has foretold how his future biographer will reduce all his thoughts and actions "to lists of dates and facts" and how all these will then be forgotten.

And none will know the gleam there used to be
About the feast days freshly kept by me,
But men will call the golden hour of bliss
"About this time," or "shortly after this."

(From *Biography*)

These convenient connectives, one finds, are largely employed about him now;—in the presence of so many conflicting assertions, how else can one make one's paragraph? My own account³ was as bad in this respect as most of the others. By saying that he

¹ An honorable exception, Mr. Louis Untermeyer's note in *Modern British Poetry* (Harcourt, 1920) proved to be both explicit and correct—except that Herefordshire was misprinted Hertfordshire.

² *Poems and Plays*, 1918, Vol. I, Preface, p. vi.

³ In G. R. Elliott and Norman Foerster's *English Poetry of the Nineteenth Century* (Macmillan, 1923), p. 813.

was born "c. 1875" and "grew up in the West of England," I thought that I had achieved a respectable scholarly vagueness on these points. The publishers, however, who are also Mr. Masefield's publishers, insisted on changing my date to 1874, which I felt sure but could not prove to be wrong. It is, then, to correct myself as well as others that the present brief statement is offered.

Masefield was born at the house known as "The Knapp" in Ledbury, Herefordshire, on June 1, 1878. I ascertained the fact by consulting the town records. In the register of births his Christian names are given as John Edward; his father's name and profession as George Edward Masefield, Solicitor; and his mother's maiden name as Caroline Louisa Parker. The mother's death is recorded as of January 20, 1885. The father's death, which occurred not long after, I did not find recorded at Ledbury. After the death of the parents the Masefield children were taken to their aunt's home, The Priory, in Ledbury, and there they grew up. In an article appearing in another publication, I have dealt with the scenery of Ledbury as an element in Masefield's first narrative poems, especially *The Everlasting Mercy*.

Masefield must have been just barely or not quite fourteen years old when he left Ledbury for his training ship, the *Conway*. That would accord with his own statement about the event and with the deductions that may be drawn from Miss Nicholl's careful article, referred to in the next paragraph. The statement made by Professor William Lyon Phelps⁴ and others, and widely credited, that he ran away to sea, is without foundation. It would be nearer the truth (though still untrue) to say that he ran away *from* sea. After his period of training on the *Conway* and a year regularly at sea, Masefield, who had suffered a slight touch of sunstroke, obtained permission to leave the service, and, when not yet seventeen years of age, he gave up the sea for good.

Of his two years in Yonkers, with their rich delights of literature, I can do no better than refer the reader to the important article by Miss Louise Townsend Nicholl in the (New York)

⁴ In "The Advance of English Poetry in the Twentieth Century," Part III, *Bookman*, December, 1917 (later issued in book form with the same title).—Very soundly, Professor Phelps emphasizes the absurdity of supposing (as many do) "that the Ledbury boy was an uncouth vagabond, who, without reading, without education, and without training, suddenly

Bookman for January, 1919. She gives a coherent and seemingly accurate account of Masfield's movements from the time he left his ship in New York harbor on the 9th or 10th day of April, 1895, to his departure for England on July 4th, 1897. She gathered and recorded the impressions of the people in Yonkers with whom the young Masfield was most intimate, and she printed three sonnets (two serious and one jocose) which he wrote at this time and which his friends had saved. Altogether, Miss Nicholl's article should prove very valuable to the future biographer, and it is extremely interesting to the contemporary reader. One may learn from it how very incidental was that unduly celebrated episode, the young Englishman's employment for a short time as bartender.

The record of the next few years is not yet filled out. Apparently, he came to London, where, Mr. W. H. Hamilton⁵ tells us, he settled in Bloomsbury and made friends with J. M. Synge.⁶ "Shortly after this," in one of the formulas of *Biography*, he was for six months on the staff of the *Manchester Guardian*. Of his relations with fellow-workers while in this employment, we are told by the same authority that his "reserve was invulnerable"; he declined their intimacy but gained their respect. Then he returned to London, to tackle literary work more seriously. A list of his writings is given in Mr. Iolo Aneurin Williams's bibliography.⁷ *The Everlasting Mercy*, appearing in the *English Review* for October, 1911, put him into the front rank among contemporary poets. In the following year the Royal Society of Literature awarded him the Edmond de Polignac prize for poetry. The growth of his reputation through subsequent books, his non-combatant service on the Western front, his lecture tour in America in 1916, and his writing of *Gallipoli*⁸ are too recent and too familiar

became a poet. He had a good school education before going to sea; and from earliest childhood he longed to write . . . during all the years of bodily toil, afloat and ashore, he had the mind and the aspirations of a man of letters."

⁵ In his *John Masfield: a critical study*, London, 1922.

⁶ See Masfield's article on Synge, *Contemporary Review*, April, 1911.

⁷ *Bibliographies of Modern Authors*, No. 2, *John Masfield*, compiled by I. A. Williams (London, Leslie Chaundy and Company; New Haven, The Brick Row Book Shop, Inc.), 1921.

⁸ For the circumstances under which it was written, see the Preface to the second (1923) edition.

to need recounting. He had been married in 1903, and a son and a daughter had been born. A pleasant glimpse of the family life is afforded by Mr. John Cournos's narrative⁹ of his visit at the Masefields' house in 1912, when they were living in the village of Great Hampden, Buckinghamshire. The article is chiefly interesting, however, for its indications of Mr. Masefield's intellectual interests at that time and for some of his literary judgments and observations which it records.

Perhaps the only serious misconception about Masefield's career, to which the various misstatements of fact have led, is the impression that he was nearly thirty years old before poetry, so to speak, took hold of him. For this mistaken notion, I am afraid, we must hold Professor Manly and Miss Rickert in some measure responsible; for their account,¹⁰ which unfortunately commits all the errors previously specified (that he was born in 1874, in Shropshire,—which furnishes the scenery of his early poems,—ran away, came to America in 1902, and *thereupon* first applied himself with passion and system to the reading of poetry), has been followed by a number of later books of wide circulation. This combination of two incorrect dates results, as will be seen, in a picture of Masefield undergoing his initiation into poetry at the age of twenty-eight, whereas it was really a boy of eighteen who made his appearance in William Palmer East's bookshop in Yonkers and impressed the proprietor with that "faint sense of the unusual and the compelling about him." So much could have been learned from Miss Nicholl's article, which is duly listed in the Manly-Rickert manual; that the date of the plunge into Chaucer was 1896, not 1902, is stated, indeed, by Masefield himself in the Preface to the collected *Poems and Plays*. The importance of the fact need not be dwelt upon. Professor Manly and Miss Rickert, I am sure, would be the first to acknowledge that it makes considerable difference whether we think of a man of letters as beginning at eighteen or at twenty-eight. It seems worth while to attempt to check the further spreading of this error concerning one of the chief contemporary poets.

Union College.

STANLEY P. CHASE.

⁹ In the *Independent* for September 5, 1912.

¹⁰ In *Contemporary British Literature: Bibliographies and Study Outlines*, by J. M. Manly and Edith Rickert, 1922, p. 111.

TERESA BLOUNT AND "ALEXIS"

Among the letters to Martha and Teresa Blount preserved by the Blount family at Mapledurham House near Reading, and well known as Popeiana, is a series of some twenty-five written during 1713,¹ in which the author addresses the two sisters as Parthenissa and Zephylinda and signs himself Alexis. Only one of these letters is superscribed to Martha; the rest were Teresa's. Among them also is a single letter in another hand from "Alexander" to Parthenissa. The staple of these letters is society gossip from London seasoned with much silly amorous chatter—perfunctory and conventional, and obviously intended merely for amusement—and with occasional excursions into the risqué, not unlike Pope's in his correspondence with the two sisters.

Editors of Pope have unhesitatingly ascribed these letters to James Moore-Smythe, and earlier ones were even able to find in them a perfectly satisfactory explanation for Pope's savage attacks on him in *The Dunciad* and elsewhere. William Lisle Bowles says, inaccurately enough, that Teresa under the name of Zephylinda, corresponded with James Moore *for some years*, and maintains that "this accounts more than anything else for Pope's inveteracy to him. James Moore had robbed him of Teresa as Lord Hervey afterward did of his idol, Lady Mary."² Later students of Pope, having noted that there was a lapse of a dozen years between the letters and Pope's squabble with Moore-Smythe, and that in the meantime the two men had been friends, have been unable to accept this interesting motivation of Pope's animosity, but have gone on recording the fact that Moore-Smythe and Teresa Blount corresponded romantically under the names of Zephylinda and Alexis. Carruthers, who says, fifty years after Bowles, that he was the first student of his time to gain access to the Mapledurham papers, declares that throughout the year 1713 Moore-Smythe wrote "sentimental fopperies" to the Blount sisters, as their "poetical attendant and correspondent."³ The only suggestion of doubt as to the

¹ A few of the letters are undated, but they all seem to belong to the one sequence.

² *Works of Pope*, 1806, I, XLVII.

³ *Life of Pope*, 2nd ed., 1857, pp. 71, 438-440. The Alexander letter re-

authorship of the Alexis letters seems to be in C. W. Dilke's expression of a hope that the new editors [Elwin and Courthope] "will perhaps . . . tell us what truth there was in the stories about Zephyllinda and Alexis, Teresa Blount and James Moore-Smythe."⁴

Had these various scholars ever happened to consider the date of Moore-Smythe's birth, they would never have done him the doubtful honor to believe him the author of these letters. James Moore, who later took his maternal grandfather's name of Smythe, was born, according to the records of Oxford, in 1702. He had, therefore, reached the tender age of eleven when Alexis was sending down into the country to a Zephyllinda of twenty-five, missives of "sentimental foppery" and scandalous gossip — stuff such as no child of eleven, however precocious, could conceivably have written. Alexis was apparently a beau who spent his time in those fashionable amusements which he describes at first hand, and who says in one of his letters (July 30), "I was some hours with Mr. Pope yesterday, who has, to use his own words, a mighty respect for the two Miss Blounts."

On searching for reasons why Alexis is identified with Moore-Smythe, one finds that none are offered. There is a mere statement of the fact, repeated by each editor or critic, and that is all. One of the letters, however, furnishes a clue. An undated note, written by Alexis from a tavern in London, where he is in company with one G. Bagnall, has a postscript wherein the said Bagnall refers to Alexis as "Mr. Moor"—"Mr. Moor, having, I suppose, told you what news there is. . . ." It was of course an easy matter for an editor of Pope, reading all the Mapledurham papers in his function as Pope scholar, to link this "Mr. Moor" with the Moore on whom

ferred to above was marked by some early reader "Alex. Pope to Martha Blount," an ascription corrected, it is believed by Carruthers, to "James Moore Smythe, not Pope." Carruthers takes it for granted that Alexander and Alexis were one, and even cites this letter as an instance of Alexis' (or Moore Smythe's) epistolary style. He declares, "The loose, sprawling handwriting and ineffable nonsense of the letter proclaim its author." This in spite of the fact that the letter, which is assuredly "loose and sprawling" is in an entirely different hand from that of Alexis, which there is no reason to call either loose or sprawling. Who Alexander was it is at present impossible to say.

⁴ *Papers of a Critic*, 1875, I, 154 ff.

Pope had later bestowed some slight measure of uncomfortable immortality. At any rate, this seems to be the source of the error.

The letters themselves also reveal the true author, Alexis, or "Mr. Moor," as G. Bagnall calls him, as one of the Moores of Fawley Court in Berkshire, about twenty miles west of Mapledurham. Allusions in the letters make this perfectly apparent—"since I came to Fawley," "my sister Moor" "our butler from Fawley is come to town," "I will take Mapledurham on my way home," etc. Moreover there is in the correspondence a letter dated October 13th, and written from somewhere in the country, in which romantic "Zephylinda" and "Alexis" are dropped for plain "Teresa Blount" and "H. Moore." This letter, which is in the Alexis hand, promises more frivolous intelligence when next the writer goes up to town, and alludes to several recognizable pieces of choice gossip already reported.

The Blounts and the Moores of Fawley were very old Catholic families and were allied by two marriages in the middle of the seventeenth century, one in a collateral line, and one between a daughter of Sir Henry Moore (created baronet in 1627) and Sir Richard Blount of Mapledurham. The H. Moore of Alexis fame was doubtless Henry, a twin brother of the contemporary baronet, Sir Richard Moore.⁵

The relationship between Alexis and Zephylinda may then be easily imagined. They were members of two of those old Catholic families which formed one of the most exclusive and aristocratic groups in England. The social relations of a Catholic family were practically altogether with other Catholic families, a fact which, in view of the small number of Catholic gentry, must have led to a comparatively narrow circle of friends and a correspondingly high degree of intimacy. Thus the Blounts had nothing to do with their Protestant neighbors, but found their friends altogether among Catholics. The tone of the Alexis letters indicates a close family acquaintance. Their author refers continually in intimate terms to other members of the family, implies that Martha will see what he is writing to Teresa, and speaks once of Teresa's having laid it on him as a duty to write every post. The letters are certainly not love-letters. The high-flown, extravagant love-making

⁵ See Wotton, *English Baronetage*, and B. M. Add. Mss. 19142, p. 222.

in them is, rather, merely an attempted exercise of wit; Alexis is trying to give life and vivacity to his compositions. One may answer Dilke's query by saying that not only were Teresa and Moore-Smythe in all probability unacquainted, but also that, as far as one can judge from his letters, there was no relation beyond close family friendship between her and the real Alexis, Henry Moore.

After all then, these letters, beyond one or two passing allusions, have no direct bearing on Pope; they are interesting Popeiana only in that they illustrate the lives of his friends the Blount sisters.⁶

University of Minnesota.

JAMES T. HILLHOUSE.

NOTES ON OLD ENGLISH POETRY

(1). *Exeter Gnostic Verses*, 150 ff.

Gryre sceal for grēggum, græf dēadum men;
hungre hēofeð, nales þæt hēafe bewindeð,
ne hūru wæl wēpeð wulf sē grāga.

In *Beowulf*, both in the description of the hero's funeral (ll. 3134 ff.) and in other passages referring to funeral ceremony (ll. 1108 ff., 2124 ff.), the dead body is burnt upon a pyre. Yet, as Chadwick has pointed out (*The Heroic Age*, pp. 44 f.), the practice of cremation seems to have passed out of use among the Anglo-Saxons about the middle of the sixth century, at least a generation before the arrival of the Christian missionaries. Since *Beowulf* in its present form cannot be older than the end of the seventh century, its references to cremation must be due to tradition (cf. Chambers, *Beowulf, An Introduction*, p. 125), and the final funeral-song, delivered by a band of horsemen who ride round the memorial mound (ll. 3169 ff.), must be part of the tradition. Probably, however, this funeral-song was little affected by the change from cremation to burial, and when the dead man was a king or lord it may still have been delivered by a band of chosen

⁶ The writer is indebted to Mrs. E. F. Riddell-Blount of Mapledurham for permission to examine this correspondence, and also for much interesting information concerning the letters and the general history of the Blount family. The present orderly state of the Mapledurham papers is due to her care and interest.

thanes who rode round the grave. These three lines from the *Exeter Gnostic Verses* are perhaps some evidence of this. "There shall be terror on account of the grey (wolf), and a grave for the dead man. It cries out from hunger, and does not encircle that (grave) with lamentation; and certainly the grey wolf does not weep for the murder." The howl of the wolf, the poet may mean, is a cry of hunger, not of grief, and very unlike the lamentation of those who ride round the dead man's grave.

(2). *The Ruin*, 27 f.

Wurdon hyra wigsteal wēstenstapolas,
brosnade burgsteall.

The poet is describing the destruction of the city. *Wigsteal* has always been taken to be the compound of *wig*, "war," and *steall*, "position," that occurs twice elsewhere in O. E. poetry (*Solomon and Saturn*, 103, *Mind of Men*, 39) and renders *propugnaculum* in glosses. But there is another word *wigsteall*, of which the first part is not *wig*, "war," but *wīg*, *wih*, *wēoh*, "idol," "fane." It is found as a gloss of *absida*, and is translated in Bosworth-Toller "the part of the church where the altar stands." It may quite well be this second word which is used here, and in its literal sense of "place of idols," "temple." The line would then mean "Their temples" (not, "their bulwarks") "became waste places," and would probably be a reminiscence of one or two passages in the Old Testament, e. g., *Amos VII, 9, Et demolientur excelsa idoli, et sanctificationes Israel desolabuntur*, or *Micah I, 7*. If, as is pretty certain, the ruined city is Roman Aquae Sulis, modern Bath, we know that in the midst of the Roman baths there stood a temple originally sacred to Sul Minerva.

(3). *The Text of "The Wanderer."*

6. *Swā cwæð eardstapa*. "So said the Wanderer." The past tense *cwæð* must refer to what precedes, and lines 1 to 5 should be placed within inverted commas, as the beginning of the Wanderer's soliloquy. Contrast *ācwīð*, present tense, referring to what follows, in line 91.

29. The ms. (Exeter Book) reading would appear to be *wēman* rather than *wenian*. *Wēman*, "to entice," "to attract," suits the context quite well.

85. The ms. has quite clearly *ypde*. Thorpe, Wülker, and all subsequent editors have given *ypðe* as the ms. reading, and emended to *ypde*.

(4). *The Rhymed Poem*, 1 f.

Mē lifes onlāh sē þis leoht onwrah
ond þæt torhte geteoh tillice onwrah.

The failure of good rhyme in line 2 is very suspicious, and Grein emended *geteoh* to *getāh*, which he translated by "disciplinam." In an article in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, XXI, 510, I suggested that *getāh* might be the past tense of *getēon*, "to grant" (instead of *getēah*). I now think it more probable that in the original (Anglian) manuscript the two lines ran as follows,

Me lifes onleh se þis leht onwreh
ond þæt torhte geteh tillice onwreh.

with the rhymes *onlēh*, *onwrēh*, *getēh*, *onwrēh*, these forms arising by smoothing from *onlēah*, *onwrēah*, and *getēah*. *Lēon* and *wrēon* are verbs belonging to the 1st Ablaut series, but the former occasionally, and the latter more often than not, form their past tenses on the analogy of the verbs of the 2nd Ablaut series. The scribe who made the rather inefficient translation of the poem into West Saxon, however, turned *onlēh* and *onwrēh* into the regular forms *onlāh* and *onwrah*, but (since there is no form **getāh*) took *geteh* (W. S. *geteoh*) to be the noun meaning "implement," and to be the object of the second *onwrah*.

I would therefore suggest the following text and translation,

Mē lifes onlēah sē þis leoht onwrēah,
ond þæt torhte getēah, tillice onwrēah,

"He granted me life, who revealed this sun, and gave the bright (sun), graciously revealed (it)." No student of *The Rhymed Poem* will be surprised at the feeble tautology.,

W. S. MACKIE.

University of Cape Town.

O. F. *ERCIER*, *ERSER*.

The O. F. word *ercier* (*erser*) has never been attested, as far as I have been able to determine, in O. F. published texts nor has it been listed in dictionaries of Old French. It seems to me to be a curious fact, therefore, that I have chanced upon it in three passages. I have noted it twice (cf. *a* and *b* below) in a thirteenth century manuscript of Old French *fabliaux*¹ now in the possession of Lord and Lady Middleton of Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire, England, to whom my thanks are due for permitting me to obtain a rotograph copy of their manuscript. The author of these *fabliaux*, a certain *jongleur* Gautier le Leu, was a native of Haute Picardie and flourished probably during the first half of the 13th century. His language is picturesquely popular and it is evident from the subject matter of his *fabliaux* that his audiences were not refined ones. Certain very unusual and unique words found in the text of the *fabliaux*, among them *ercier*, must have been intelligible in Gautier's day to the public that frequented the taverns and public squares where he recited his poems.

(a)

Puis a les .II. traus mesurés,
Il ne fu mie bellurés
Qu'il n'ait contremont *erciet* ²
Qu'il a au plus lone aderciet.

(Ms. *De l'Aventure d'Ardenne*)

(b)

Tant s'est de totes pars *erciés*
Qu'il est a son lit aderciés

(Ms. *De Deus Vilains*)

The third occurrence of the word in the form *erser* is found in the text of a prose tale by Philippe de Vigneulles which was written in Metz between the years 1505 and 1515:³

¹ See *Historical Manuscripts Commission. Report of the Manuscripts of Lord Middleton preserved at Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire* (Hereford, 1911), pp. 233 f.

² This verse and the one following are lacking in the published version of the *fabliau*, cf. Montaiglon et Reynaud, *Recueil Général des Fabliaux*, Paris, 1880, I, p. 232 (*Del Sot Chevalier*).

³ The manuscript is in the possession of the author of this article, cf. *Revue du XIVe siècle*, x (1923), 159-203.

(a)

Car le ventre et la vecye luy commençoit a doloir tant avoit grant besoing de pisser et ne se osoit bouger. Et tellement que pour la grant fain qu'il avoit de pisser et de laicher son eue le membre viril commença ung peu a *erser* et a dresser et luy ennuyoit de tant estre a table.

(Ms. *Contes de Philippe de Vigneulles*)

In the first two passages from the *fabliaux* of Gautier le Leu *ercier* rhymes with *adercier*, a Picard form of the verb *adrecier*. In the third case *erser* is used along with *dresser*. It is strongly probable that the etymon is Latin *ērectus* (*ērigēre*) plus a verbal suffix *-iare* which was much used in V. L. to form verbs from participles and adjectives. Other forms of similar derivation are **captiare* > *chasser*; *directiare* > *dresser*; *pertusiare* > *percer*; *punctiare* > *poincier*, etc. and hypothetical forms: **corruptiare* > *coursier*; **strictiare* > O. F. *estrecier*; **tractiare* > *tracer*, etc. Therefor V. L. **ērectiare* > **erecier* > *ercier*, *erser*. An influence of *adercier*, *dercier*, (*adresser*, *dresser*) might have contributed toward the omission of the *e* of the second syllable in parts of the verb where the *e* was unaccented, and the prevailing of these forms.⁴

The finding of this word in two authors between whom several centuries elapsed would tend to show that it was persistent even if dialectal. To judge by the evidence of all of the passages, it was continually associated with *adresser* and *dresser*, the possible influence of which on the form has been noted.

The etymon suggested might account also for the meaning of the word. In passage *b* it is used reflexively in the sense of *se diriger* (one of the rare meanings of O. F. *drecier*), but in the other two passages it is intransitive with the meaning of rise, go up. The only other traces of *ērigēre*, *ērectus* in French are to be found in modern French *alerte*, (borrowed from Italian) and in O. F. *aerdre* if it derives from **aderigere*, which seems to be more than doubtful.⁵

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON.

Bowdoin College.

⁴ Cf. the forms of O. F. *corecier*, *corecer*, etc. with shortened forms *courcier*, *courser*, etc. both series apparently in frequent use. Both forms are used by Froissart (II, 29, 102, 169; V, 208).

⁵ Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Etym. Wört.*, no. 162.

SHAKESPEARE'S MEACOCKE

'Tis a world to see
How tame when men and women are alone,
A meacocke wretch can make the curstest shrew.

Taming of the Shrew, II, 1, 307 seq.

Editors of the *Shrew* define *meacocke* as 'timorous, spiritless, effeminate, henpecked.' Dictionaries add to this list: 'silly,'¹ uxorious,² cowardly.³ Quotations from English Literature listed by Halliwell,⁴ Wright,⁵ Nares,⁶ Farmer and Henley,⁷ and the *New English Dictionary* justify these definitions, for the word is used substantively as synonymous with *fool*, *milksop*, *dastard*, *coward*.

Although writers agree upon its meaning, only a few attempt a conjecture as to its etymology. Bailey⁸ suggests "*mew cock*, one who mews himself up out of harm's way in any danger." Pope, also, gives "*mew cock*, or one who has been shut up." Johnson quotes Skinner "*mes coq*" which Nares ridicules, and declares "The plain English compound meek-cock, is a much more probable account of it; being frequently, and perhaps originally applied to a hen-pecked husband, a cock that yielded to the hen."⁹ This explanation is still accepted by some writers,¹⁰ though the *NED* considers it "untenable," explaining that the word is "of obscure

¹ Halliwell, *Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words*.

² Coles, *English-Latin, Latin-English Dictionary*.

³ Nares, *Glossary*.

⁴ Halliwell, *Op. cit.*

⁵ Wright, *Provincial Dictionary*.

⁶ Nares, *Op. cit.*

⁷ *Slang and its Analogues*.

⁸ *Etymological English Dictionary*.

⁹ The possible explanation of *meacock* as 'meek cock' might be found in the characterization of the capon as meek. Batman, *Upon Bartholome* (p. 582, Liber Duodecimus, cap. 17), says of the capon, he "loseth his boldness, and his voice . . . he sitteth on broode uppon egges that be not his own as it were an henne, and taketh uppon him the office of a female, . . . and the capon is more coward of heart than the cocke." If, however, capon and meacock were synonymous, Shakespeare would probably have used the latter in "Mome, malt-horse, capon, coxcomb, idiot, patch!" (*Comedy of Errors*, III, 1-32).

¹⁰ Cf. *Taming of the Shrew*, Arden Ed.

origin: perhaps originally a name of some bird." Two quotations make this seem probable:

"For my part I shall no more be such a meacock
To deal with the plumes of a Hyde-Park Peacock."¹¹
"As fine a fi'pence, as proud as a peacock,
As stout as a stockfish, as meek as a meacock."¹²

The latter comparison of meacock with stockfish, would suggest that, if it is a bird, it is probably an aquatic, or shore bird. The first instance of the use of the word in English Literature cited by the *NED* is: "He sholde be no cowarde, no maycocke, no fearfull persone that dare nothyng enterpryse."¹³ In this quotation, as will be observed, the spelling is *maycocke*, though subsequently, it varies between *meacock* and *mecock*, with addition of a final *e*.

There may be a connection between this word and *maycock*, the provincial name for the grey plover (*Squatarola Helvetica*),¹⁴ a bird whose shy and wary habits may have provoked the epithets *timorous*, *weak*, and *cowardly*. These birds travel singly or in flocks of ten or twelve, and so secretive are they, that ornithologists searched vainly many years for their breeding places and nests. Romance, superstition,¹⁵ and legend¹⁶ became attached to the bird. The first eggs were taken by Von Middendorf in 1843.

¹¹ D'Urfey, *Pills*, 1872, iv, 14.

¹² *Appius and Virginia*, Dodsley, *Old Plays*, iv, 118.

¹³ Wynkyn de Worde, *Pylgrimage of Perfection*, 1526 (Quoted from *NED*).

¹⁴ H. K. Swann, *A Dictionary of English and Folknames of British Birds*, London: Witherby and Co., 1913.

¹⁵ Marguerite D'Angoulême expresses one of these superstitions in *L'Heptaméron*, nouvelle Trente-Deuxiesme: "'Vous vivez donc de foi et d'esperance.' dit Nomerside, Comme le pluvier du vent, vous êtes bien alsé à nourrir." Paris: Alphonse Lemerre, Éditeur, 1879, p. 179.

¹⁶ The Rumanian story: *Why do the Plover Fly Singly?* is an example of the legends. It is as follows: "In the beginning, the plover used to fly in large coveys. But one day, when Our Lady was riding on a horse, they ran across the road and frightened the horse so much that it threw the rider. Angry at the mishap, St. Mary cursed the plover that they should no longer gather in coveys but should go singly. And so it has remained to this very day. The plover nest quite alone and never join others in their flight." *Rumanian Bird and Beast Stories in Folk Lore*, Vol. LXXV, p. 183. London: Sedgwick and Jackson, 1915.

In 1875, Seebohm and Harvie-Brown found eleven nests on the tundras of Petchora 68° N. latitude.¹⁷ Subsequent study revealed the fact that the gray plover breeds in Arctic Europe and Asia beyond the limit of forest growth. Although a few young birds stop in England on their way south, the most of them winter in Africa and the Mediterranean Basin. Late in May, they pass along the coast of England on the way to their breeding place.¹⁸ Perhaps, for this reason, they are called meacocks. Little is yet known of the breeding habits of the bird, except that the mate shares in the incubation.¹⁹

It does not seem unlikely that the wariness and shyness observed in the plover, coupled with the mystery surrounding its habits, led to the application of *meek*, and *fearful*. These, gathering strength through repetition, became *weakling*, *dastard*, *coward*, and gave rise to such uses as: "For you are meacocks, fools, and miserable";²⁰ "A meacock is he who dreads to see blood shed";²¹ and "The meacock verse that dares not sing."²¹

Johns Hopkins University.

MARIE L. C. LINTHICUM.

REVIEWS

Las Bacantes o del origen del teatro. By ADOLFO BONILLA Y SAN MARTÍN. Madrid, 1921. 168 pp.

In the first of the four chapters which form this book Professor Bonilla questions the traditional view of a common "Dionysiac" origin of Greek tragedy and comedy. If the primitive form of the Greek dithyramb is reducible to "el canto aislado de un poeta" (p. 22), referring to the actions and history of the god, and there-

¹⁷ Charles Stonham, *The Birds of the British Islands*. London: Grant Richards, 1916, Vol. IV, p. 610. Or see Mr. Seebohm's own account in his *British Birds*, Vol. III, p. 38.

¹⁸ *The British Bird Book*, ed. by F. B. Kirkman. London: T. C. and E. C. Jack, 1910, Vol. VIII, p. 357.

¹⁹ Males were shot from eggs by Seebohm (*Op. cit.*, III, p. 38), and by Slater (*British Birds with Their Nests and Eggs*, Vol. V, p. 77).

²⁰ Beaumont, *Wit Without Money*, II, 11-40.

²¹ Quoted from Farmer and Henley, *Op. cit.*

fore of a narrative nature, then an epic origin may be claimed for tragedy. Using Nietzsche's terminology, "la tragedia, en su forma clásica, es lo *Apolíneo*, y la comedia, lo propiamente *Dionisiaco*" (p. 23); in tragedy man is made to realize his bondage, in comedy he finds his liberation. Of course, the validity of this thesis, as applied to the origins, will have to be tested by students of Greek literature.

The interest of the Hispanist centers on the following chapters, which take up all but thirty-five pages of the book. The author disclaims any attempt at a thorough study of the evolution of the Spanish stage before Lope de Vega, but purposes: "de trazar los remotos orígenes de nuestra escena . . . y de clasificar las más importantes corrientes dramáticas anteriores a la dominación literaria del 'Fénix de los ingenios.'" This part is not without connection with the opening chapters, since the fundamental distinction enunciated there forms the esthetic background of the author's classification. The various currents distinguished for the sake of clearer analysis are credited in turn with certain "Apolonic" and "Dionysiac" qualities, which eventually mingled in fortunate proportions, created the Spanish *comedia*.

The material available on the transitional period after the end of Roman civilization, collected from inscriptions, the Church Fathers, canons and councils and secular laws, is here conveniently arranged, showing that throughout the darkest ages a dramatic tradition of some sort maintained itself. It might be observed that both Glöck and Allen have seriously questioned Reich's representation of the *mime* as the savior of tradition.¹

The Valera-Cañete controversy on the liturgical origin of the modern Spanish drama, although dormant, is really not closed. The evident historic connection between Church and drama, as the author points out (p. 75), does not imply a causal relation between them. Yet it seems that so far not enough evidence of secular influence at the time of the earliest preserved dramas has been collected to reopen the question.

¹ A. Glöck, *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Litgesch.* XVI (1905), 25-45, 172-191. P. S. Allen, *Mod. Phil.*, VII (1909-10), 329 ff., VIII, 1 ff. R. Herzog's attack on Reich (*Berliner philol. Wochenschrift*, 1904, nr. 34) has been countered by Winterfeld, *Deutsche Dichter des Mittelalters*, München, 1917, *Anhang*, II, 470-528.

The reader of Isidore's *Etymologies*, of Papias's *Elementarium*, or the great *Catholicon* of Johannes Januensis² will be easily convinced that the secret of the Classical drama was completely lost. It is very doubtful whether Isidore, for one, given a comedy of Terence, could have even remotely realized its possibilities for esthetic enjoyment. What might be questioned, therefore, pending the discovery of further material on the origins, is not so much the point of fact as the specific importance of the medieval origins for the development of the modern drama. If left to themselves, what would the early liturgical plays have produced? The answer lies in the dull and formless religious plays of the sixteenth century, when untouched by Classical influence. Is it not true that without the liturgical drama the meaning of the Terence and Plautus manuscripts, of the dramaturgic passages in the Roman grammarians, of Aristotle's *Poetics* would have been eventually discovered, and would have informed and disciplined the human instinct of mimicry, creating an instrument of delight centuries advanced beyond the liturgical stage? In fact, with the liturgical drama in full efflorescence, the modern world was pathetically slow in grasping the lesson of Classical dramaturgy, failed indeed for a time to recognize any relationship between the two. Encina's *Plácida y Vitoriano*, perhaps, but surely Torres Naharro's *Himenea*, the first real Spanish drama, could not have existed but for the rediscovery in Italy of the Greek "invention" of the drama.

Professor Bonilla includes in his survey a number of hybrids such as the Catalan *Mascarón*, recited, according to Milá, by one single performer, and representations, some entirely inanimate, some in the nature of *tableaux vivants*, with written and sometimes spoken explanations, often with music and even elaborate mechanical scenery. This should open promising fields of research on the outskirts of the drama. The so-called *comedia alegórica* of 1414 is rightly (cf. Crawford, *Rev. hisp.*, XXIV, 9) put down as an elaborate *momo*, although the spoken *coplas* should no longer be credited to Villena. (Bonilla, p. 82). It might be added that

² Cf. E. H. Hall, *Papias and his contemporaries*, Boston, 1899. E. Brehaut, *An encyclopedist of the Dark Ages, Isidore of Seville*, New York, 1912.

the five so-called *autos* performed in Valladolid in 1527 were no doubt productions of the same nature, as a comparison of Sandoval's description with the report of similar entertainments at Saragossa in 1399 will show.³ Interesting additions are made to what we know about the use of the word *entremés* from Milá, Rouanet, Restori, Cotarelo, and Bonilla's own edition of the *entremeses* of Cervantes. Lamarca's interpretation of *entramesos* as mimic representations or *rocas* mostly on wheels, is confirmed by Pedroso and Milá.⁴ In the *entremeses* which Milá describes, such as the representation of the battle of Saint Michael with the host of Lucifer, lies the connection of the drama with the allegorical tournament, a field still untouched for the history of romantic subject-matter in Spain. It seems doubtful whether Cristóbal de Villalón uses the word *entremés* in the dramatic sense. About 1550 the term was still currently used (by Palau, for example) with the meaning of jest, and continued to be used as such even after the dramatic *entremés* had unquestionably taken shape. With Cueva, however,⁵ the word seems to have definitely acquired the meaning of *lance representable*. With Timoneda (*Turiana*, 1565) it seems to have lost the connotation of "something in-between," and encroaches actually on the prologue (*Passo de dos clérigos*). The definition (p. 87, n. 1) of the *mimo*, and its identification with the *entremés* by Padre José Alcazar, were, of course, borrowed by the latter from Caramuel.

The final chapter of the book is the longest and perhaps the most important. Bibliographical indications here are purposely scanty, as the author promises an amplification of this part. First consideration is given to the *Celestina* and its school. That the "sense of tragedy" of the *Celestina*, had it not been smothered under the bucolic tendencies of Encina and Italian importations, might have then and there caused a blossoming of noteworthy drama, seems true enough, and is confirmed by the fact that the *Himenea* has caught more of the bitter-sweet flavor of that amazing book than any other product of the sixteenth century.

The *estilo pastoril* is next distinguished, represented by Encina,

³ Sandoval, *Hist. del emperador Carlos V*, Amberes, 1681, I, 619; Milá, *Orígenes*, 236 ff.

⁴ B. AA. EE., LVIII, xv; Milá, 248.

⁵ Cf. Licio in the *Comedia del Tutor* (1579), ed. Icaza, I, 367.

Fernández, Gil Vicente, and Diego Sánchez de Badajoz. In discussing Encina's claim to the title of founder of this school it should not be forgotten that the little nativity-play in Íñigo de Mendoza's *Vita Christi*, although meant to be read, is already a perfect model of its kind, using the so-called *sayagués*, and with the shepherd type so well developed that it is difficult to consider even this as a first attempt. Certain important themes, which run through many productions of the *estilo pastoril*, such as the consistent defeat of the rustic competing with the courtier for the favor of a lady, are obviously derived from a tradition of lyrical poetry, also much older than Encina. The distinction between Encina and Fernández is perhaps too severe against Fernández, and it may be questioned whether "la insufrible brutalidad que muestran muchas de las farsas pastoriles de la primera mitad del siglo XVI, más que con el teatro de Encina, se entronca con el de Lucas Fernández" (p. 111). The reference (p. 113) to possible French influence, as yet undetermined, in Gil Vicente⁶ again opens a promising vista. The pointer about the Spanish *pulla* is also worth following up.

It is curious to notice what conflicting opinions have been expressed about some little-read sixteenth-century plays. Thus, the *Égloga* (later *Farsa*) of Juan de Paris, probably written about 1520 (Kohler) and first printed in 1536, is here called "linda" and "uno de los ejemplares más perfectos en su género" (p. 118). Ticknor considered it a remarkable mixture, but I confess to a very poor opinion of it from any point of view. The *Comedia Fenisa*, which Moratín, I believe, considered worthless, was undoubtedly very popular,⁷ and Professor Bonilla has reprinted it, in my opinion deservedly. But it will be asked why this playlet was not included in the *estilo pastoril*, which the author describes as having simple technique, few characters, little intrigue, and at bottom "es casi siempre una cuestión de amor" (p. 123). The *Fenisa* is the earliest instance of a *caso de amor* on the Spanish stage, yet it is classified in the *estilo artificioso* (p. 128). Among the chief characteristics of the *estilo artificioso*, represented by Torres Na-

⁶ Cf. the *Auto dos quatro tempos* and the end of the *Auto da Fe*.

⁷ Eslava, in his third *Coloquio* (México, 1574) clearly alludes to the *Fenisa*, done "a lo divino."

harro and Palau's *Salamantina*, the urban character of the plays, giving realistic descriptions of town life, might well be included. The *Tragedia de los amores de Eneas y de la Reyna Dido* (p. 127) is out of place here.

The essential originality of Torres Naharro's *introito* is well brought out (125 ff.). If he did not invent it, its origin does not lie in Alione de Asti's *introitus*, nor in Italy altogether, but more probably in certain forms of the French drama. The discussion of the *bando toscano*, or current of Italian influence, includes an interesting collection of references to the popularity of Alberto Ganassa. It might be added that Ganassa is also coupled with his "side-partner," Trastulo (whose name passed into the Spanish vocabulary [*Quixote*, II, 7]), in the *Coplas de Trescientas cosas más*, and was mentioned again in a later *Loa de Disparates*, and still somewhat later credited with a popular joke by Juan de Luna.⁸ The source of the *Comedia de Sepúlveda* (pp. 132 ff.), pointed out by Crawford (*Romanic Review*, XI [1920], 76 ff.), might have been given. The note on p. 134 suggests that the development of the terms *paso* and *entremés* will bear further investigation. This also applies to the word *sainete*, which would appear to have a dramatic implication perhaps as early as the burlesque *Libro de Cetrería* of Evangelista.⁹ It is questionable that Palau used the word *entremés* with the meaning of "lance cómico representable."¹⁰ The "necio e impertinente prurito de enristrar palabrotas sin sentido . . ." (p. 136) in the plays of Alonso de la Vega is justly censured, yet must be considered as a legitimate attempt at comic appeal based on a children's game.¹¹ The reference in the *Pelegrino curioso* (p. 137, n. 2) should be credited to Fray Tomás Quixada, the embittered author of the *Consulta* prefixed to that work. Perhaps too much space is given to the *Entremés de un viejo ques*

⁸ *Coplas* (middle of sixteenth century), *Rev. hisp.*, IX (1902), 265; *Loa*, *ibid.*, XXXVII (1916), 402; Luna, *Diálogos familiares*, Paris, 1621 (first ed., 1619), p. 106. The joke still persists in modified form in Andalusia. Cf. Fernán Caballero, *Obras*, XVI, 276.

⁹ Probably fifteenth century, ed. Paz y Melia, *Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil.*, I, 222 ff.

¹⁰ Compare the instances of *Salamantina*, 1236, 2282; *Custodia del Hombre*, 2432; *Victoria de Christo*, ap. Rouanet, *Colección*, IV, 386, etc.

¹¹ Cf. Rodríguez Marín, *Cantos populares*, I, 85 ff.

casado con una muger moça. Professor Northup¹² has recently pointed out its parallel in an Italian *scenario*.

In the section on the *drama sagrado* (p. 141) attention is drawn for the first time to the source of Joseph's lament before the tomb of his mother, in Carvajal's *Josefina*. Concerning the digression on the *Loa* (p. 142, n. 2) it might be remarked that the term is already used by Diego Sánchez de Badajoz (*Farsa de la Muerte*). On the merits of Carvajal-Hurtado's *Cortes de la Muerte* I confess to disagreement with the author (p. 143); the indictment of the *conquistadores* by the Indians has a sombre power, shared in a measure by the scenes of the poor and the peasants. The *rufián* scene is graphic, that of the *ladrones* dramatic, the *pastor* is amusing, and the judge and the nun are interesting, and altogether it seems unjust to charge this play, in the sixteenth century, with "escasos bríos." In the "imitación clásica" the early translations in *lemosín* are not noticed. The *Tragedia* on Agamemnon by Anrrique Ayres Victoria appears to be an outright translation from Pérez de Oliva.¹³

The sixth (not including the *Celestina*) and last type described by the author is *el estilo trágico*. This is perhaps the most interesting part of the sixteenth-century drama, not in itself (it is very dull), but as a key to the birth of the *Comedia*, and deserves a study by itself.¹⁴ It brings the author back to the principles outlined at the start; but before finally restating these with the added weight of gathered evidence, he surveys the relationship of the sixteenth-century stage with lyrical poetry. This leads away from the main theme, but into some stimulating considerations on the early lyric. The relations of the drama with singing and music, in and out of the Church, no doubt need further investigation.

There are a few misprints (pp. 124, 127, 134, etc.), but also some interesting illustrations, especially (on p. 103) the portrait of "Alonso de Villegas," possibly the author of the *Comedia Selvagia*.

Here we have at last, for a period long blighted by the shadow

¹² *Ten Spanish Farces*, Boston [1922], p. xiii.

¹³ Cf. the edition by Francisco Esteves Pereira, Lisboa, 1918, p. 13.

¹⁴ The *Filís* of Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola (p. 149) is mistakenly connected with Dolce, where *La Alejandra* was meant.

of Cañete, not merely a chronicle-history, but an interpretation. The author himself presents his book as a preparatory sketch, and thus forestalls the possible reproach of deficient bibliography, occasional discursiveness, and a certain lack of perspective and unity. Its appeal, of course, is partly dependent upon the favor which its main thesis may, or may not, find; but divorced from the thesis, and considered as a first sketch of the Spanish drama before Lope, it is still a keen and brilliant piece of work, boldly planned, richly documented, and unusually stimulating.

JOSEPH E. GILLET.

Bryn Mawr College.

The Influence of Milton on English Poetry. By RAYMOND DEXTER HAVENS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1922.

No review can do more than suggest the wealth of detailed information which is to be found in Professor Havens' book, and which makes it henceforth one of the indispensable resources of the student of the eighteenth century. The elaborate bibliographies of eighteenth century verse at the end of the volume, valuable references in profusion in the foot-notes, long accumulations of parallels from greater and lesser poets, suggestive comments on many aspects of the poetic theory and practice of the eighteenth century, a thorough history of the sonnet—these are some of the results of years of thorough and careful study, made available to other scholars in this imposing and, let us add, beautifully printed volume.

Precisely because the work has so many of the qualities of a standard treatise and will inevitably be consulted not only by mature scholars, but by graduate students and others with varying degrees of preparation, is it necessary to question the results of this study, whether as a contribution to the interpretation of Milton or of the eighteenth century. For the book is rather depressing to the lover of English poetry. As one reads through these hundreds of carefully documented pages on the influence of Milton, the conclusion grows stronger and stronger that this influence has been on the whole unfortunate and even pernicious;

the hero of the book becomes, through no fault of his own, the villain. There are of course many passages which contradict this general impression. Professor Havens remarks, for instance, that "English poetry from Pope to Keats shows a steadily-increasing attention to the connotative, the imaginative and poetic, value of words, a change that is due largely to the influence of Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton" (p. 66). But in spite of such statements, the general impression remains, and Professor Havens seems to share it. "Miltonic" becomes synonymous with all that is bad in eighteenth-century verse, and the eighteenth century with vicious diction down to the "reeking tube and iron shard" of Kipling's *Recessional* (p. 68, n.). The *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1789 described a poem as "in blank verse, high-sounding language, without clear ideas." "Can there be any doubt," asks Professor Havens, "that it is Miltonic?" (p. 253). A few pages further on we read: "From these two poems it would seem that Hurdis had largely emancipated himself from the inflated style and language that are so ill adapted to rural descriptions. In reality he had done nothing of the kind, for in his remaining works he becomes increasingly Miltonic" (p. 261). In another place: "Many of the early translators would have been more successful if they had never read Milton" (p. 356). The style of Robert Pollok, he says, "though similar to Cowper's, is much more Miltonic. It is, indeed, strangely so for a work that appeared the same year as Tennyson's first volume; but here again it belongs with the eighteenth century" (p. 411). It is true that Professor Havens has, in the proper place, already laid the blame for this "Miltonic" diction on Thomson, and completely exonerated Milton (p. 144). But it is not at all clear that the writers of "Miltonic" diction were imitating Thomson rather than Milton, nor does Professor Havens indicate that he believes any such distinction was in their minds. All this bad verse is quoted and discussed in connection with the influence of *Milton* on English poetry.

Of course the truth regarding Milton's influence is what we want, whether pleasant or not. Professor Havens has worked with scientific precision and thoroughness to get at the truth. The difficulty with his method is really, however, that he has aimed at a greater precision than his subject would admit of, and thus

missed an essential part of it. He has traced the influence of Milton by means of certain rather obvious characteristics of style and diction. But in proportion as the imitator is great or genuinely poetical, do the limitations of this scientific technique become apparent. As Professor Havens himself says in regard to Wordsworth: "the familiar evidences of the influence of *Paradise Lost*—adjectives employed as adverbs or substantives, unusual compound epithets, parentheses, appositives, omitted words, and the rest—indicate very inadequately the extent of that influence on the poetry of Wordsworth" (p. 177). The reviewer feels that this passage suggests a kind of poetical influence which might well be sought for also in Cowper, Gray, Thomson and even in the despised lesser eighteenth century imitators, who might conceivably have been even worse poets had they not been touched, even slightly, by the divine fire of Milton. The reviewer likes to think that there is considerable Miltonic influence to be detected in Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel*. Certainly Dryden longed to write an epic poem. He thought *Annus Mirabilis* had epic characteristics. Likewise he cast his great satire in the form of an epic fragment, the whole forming a sort of parallel to the temptation motif in *Paradise Lost*. Speeches are concluded with the epic formula "He said," and here and there are lines with some of the resonance of Milton's large utterance. It does not seem extravagant, therefore, to conclude that Dryden's poem owes something of its dignity and elevation to Milton's epic. At any rate this is a kind of poetical influence which must be considered, even though no scientifically accurate method has been devised for dealing with it. And only in so far as this kind of poetical influence is measured, will we know how greatly Milton has stimulated the poetic life and genuine poetic production in writers since his time.

Certainly too much has been said proportionately regarding the diction of eighteenth-century poetry. Although since Wordsworth that period has been heavily blamed for its abuse of diction, the classical writers do not seem to have believed that poetic diction is the most poetical part of poetry. Among the critics of the Augustan age it was a commonplace that the design of the poem, its unity and total effect, is a beauty of a higher order than the delight in diction. The whole subject is one which needs further investigation, in the light of which Milton's influence on eighteenth-

century poetry will have to be re-examined, with results possibly less damaging both to Milton and to the eighteenth century than those arrived at by Professor Havens.

It should be the aim of every investigator to do his work so well that it need never be done again, and Professor Havens has worked with admirable thoroughness. But even thoroughness has its dangers, though one is seldom obliged to dwell on them. A considerable part of the output of the printing presses, whether in the eighteenth or the twentieth century, must be of little or no importance either as literature or as documents in literary history. Before we assume the importance of a poem in literary history, we must know something of its vogue, of its reception in its own day. If it was still-born, it probably has no place in history. If the eighteenth century rejected it as insignificant, literary history should in fairness to that period do likewise. It is not contended, of course, that the historian of literature should not have an insatiable and prying curiosity, nor that bibliographies should not aim at completeness. The historian uses scientific method in gathering and classifying his material, but his final product must be artistic and selective.

It would be unfair to this monumental volume to claim that it is the standard and final treatment of Milton's influence on English poetry. But students of the eighteenth century, who, as Professor Havens says, labor "in a field where assumptions and unsupported assertions have been rife and scholarship is still young," will be under deep obligations to the immense accumulation of materials, which the author himself has called the "dry bones of literary history."

University of Michigan.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD.

Modern Swedish Grammar. By IM. BJÖRKHAGEN. Stockholm, P. A. Norstedt & Söner, 1923. Pp. 204.

There has been evidenced in recent years an increasing interest both in England and Germany in the study of the Norwegian and Swedish languages. Thus there was established some years ago in Berlin University a chair in Swedish; and lectureships in both Swedish and Norwegian were established in the University

of London (University College). Swedish scholars in particular have been prompt to try to supply the needed text-books in this work, in the effort to place it on a par with other modern language instruction so far as actual class-room needs are concerned. The author of the present grammar has held the lectureship in London since it was instituted in 1918, and the book he has put out is the fruit of four years experience in the teaching of Swedish to Englishmen, with the emphasis upon the things that the English have found most troublesome. Simultaneously with the grammar there was issued a *First Swedish Book* also, but this I do not yet possess; however, according to the 'Preface' of the present work it is planned as a complement to the grammar 'with practical exercises in reading, conversation, writing, etc.' The author expresses the hope (in an accompanying letter) that his book may come to be used also in American colleges. It will, therefore, be proper to review it in an American journal; though I shall do so only very briefly, confining myself to the general plan of the work, and certain points that have been noted in the first reading of it.

The first forty-seven pages are devoted to the pronunciation. And here I am glad to see that the Swedish musical accent is not relegated to a paragraph or two, but is considered in some detail (six pages), and illustrated by rising and falling straight lines, and by curved lines in a way that should be very helpful to the beginner. The grammar proper devotes seventy-eight pages to the declensions, and fifty-eight to the verb and its use; the last twenty pages are given to the adverb, conjunction, prepositions, and the order of words. There is a Table of Sounds in Swedish, and two diagrams intended to define more in detail the differences between Swedish and English vowels. The best feature of the book is the full and clear discussion of the sounds, and particularly repeating in this part of the book, in phonetic transcription, every Swedish word that is cited. The extensive illustrative material under nouns and verbs must also be commended, as the complete listing of the plural forms of irregular noun groups. Much less satisfactory is the presentation of the use of prepositions in Swedish.

The following matters seem to me to call for a comment:

P. 16. The author says correctly that the retroflex *s* resembles the English *sh*-sound, but is formed further back. Now insofar

as the retroflex *s* and the Swedish *sh*-sound coincide only in some parts of Sweden, and are otherwise distinctly different, the retroflex *s* being a supradental *s*, it seems to me that it was unfortunate (and will, to the beginner, sometimes be misleading), to represent the supradental *s* and *sh*-sound by the same symbol (*š*). It will trouble the learner to find that *s* in *kors* and *skinn* are not pronounced alike, and yet the two words are transcribed *koš* and *šin*.

P. 17. We read "*K*, *g* and *ŋ* (*ng*) are pronounced as in English, except before a front vowel and in a final position, where they become palatalized, i. e., their point of articulation is moved much further forward." Since it is not a question here of the change of *k* to the palatal *c*(*ch*) and *g* to *j* (consonantal *y*), but merely the fronting of a velar, it would have been better to avoid the word 'palatalized,' and to say 'fronted.'

P. 24. The transcription of *journal* is given with an *o*-vowel for the *-ou-*. This is possibly a misprint, for the author, no doubt, also pronounces *furnal*, as, too, it is given in *Lyttkens och Wulff*.

P. 34. The statement under 5 that 'in many words the length of the consonant is not indicated in the spelling. This is especially the case with *m* and *n*,' is a little unsatisfactory to the student. It would be better to say that between vowels *m* and *n* are regularly written double; exceptions are *amen*, and the words *domen* and *domare*. On the other hand *m* and *n* are regularly not written double finally; to this there are few exceptions (as *damm*, 'dust,' *lamm*, 'land,' *ramm*, 'ram,' and *tunn*, 'thin,' *sann*, 'true' *skinn*, 'skin,' and the preterites *hann*(*hinna*), *fann*(*finna*), *brann*(*brinna*), and other vbs. in *-nn-*).

P. 58. The use of the definite forms in Swedish under § 27 and § 28 could be grouped and explained, as e. g., *hela dagen* and with a limited group of adjectives: *hel*, *halv*, *först*, *sist*, *slätt*, where the def. article is understood in Swedish (Eng. the whole day, the first time, etc.). Similarly: *han stoppade handen i fickan* belongs with the use of nouns referring to parts of the body or wearing apparel, in which the def. article in Swedish corresponds to the possessive in English.

P. 72. It is possible to help the student by specifying two general rules regarding what nouns belong in the Third Declension. First, it is the declension of foreign nouns, whether of one or more

syllables; second it is the declension of abstracts. Further, common gender monosyllabic nouns ending in a consonant belong here if they modify the root vowel in the plural, but this to be sure, is not a very helpful rule, since it assumes knowledge of something the rule should aid the student in ascertaining.

P. 98. The form *e(d)er* given as the alternate of *eder* is of course a misprint for *e(de)r*.

P. 130. The classifying of all verbs under four conjugations according to the supine ending: *-at, -t, -tt, -it*, as the characteristic, works some confusion, applied as here. It necessitates grouping some strong verbs under the three first (i. e., weak) conjugations, as *kunna, veta*, and *vilja* under the 1st, and *bedja, dö, få, gå, le, se, stå*, and *slå*, under the 3rd. It seems better and clearer to me to keep the classification under the preterite formation, in which some weak and several strong verbs will have an irregular supine form. It certainly will not do to give *slå-slog-slogo-slagit*, as an irregular vb. of the Third Conjugation (§ 208), while on § 213, *draga-drog-drogo-dragit*, and *hålla-höll-hölle-hållit*, are given as strong; *slå* should be given with these.

Pp. 154-161. The discussion of the Passive Voice is good and possibly everywhere clear. Under the passive voice of verbs of transition such an example as *ljusen tändas och julklapparna utdelas*, rendered 'the candles are lighted, and the Christmas gifts are distributed,' would perhaps better have been rendered 'The candles are being lighted and the Christmas gifts distributed'; and similarly in some other cases.

Under Adverbs and Prepositions I would have preferred a different grouping of some things; and particularly one which would have shown the reason for the Swedish use. As it stands it must often appear to the beginner that the adverbs and prepositions of Swedish are a maze of irregularities, and that any preposition, e. g., can mean most anything. But, as a matter of fact, it is just as often, if not more often, the English use that needs explanation. So e. g., "Have you any money *about* you?" "Mind what you are *about*." "There is no pride *about* him," to take three of the examples under 'about.' I shall not go into this, however, here.

I do not wish to give the impression that the above are very important matters that weigh against the usefulness of the book. They are, after all, but relatively minor matters in comparison

with the many excellent features. The fundamentals of the grammar are clearly presented, notes on exceptional things, colloquial pronunciation, etc., are reduced to a minimum; particularly is to be commended the way the illustrative paradigms are printed, with the characteristic of the class or group set in black-face type, and similarly sometimes that in which the Swedish expression differentiates itself from the English. The book is printed with clean type, on excellent paper and gives a most pleasing appearance; it is attractively bound. The publishers are to be congratulated on getting out such an attractive book, as is the author on its general excellence. I hope that it may find many users also in this country.

University of Illinois.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

Märchen und Traum, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Orients, von GEORG JACOB. Hannover, Orient-Buchhandlung Heinz Lafaire, 1923. 112 pp. (*Beiträge zur Märchenkunde des Morgenlandes*, herausgg. v. Georg Jacob und Theodor Menzel. I. Band.)

It is encouraging that even under present conditions books like the present are turned out in Central Europe, although outsiders will hardly surmise the greatness of the sacrifice on the part of both author and publisher.

Mr. Jacob attempts to give an outline of the close relationship between dream and fairy tale. In estimating the importance of dreams for primitive fiction he follows in the steps of Ludwig Laistner and Friedrich von der Leyen, to say nothing of Sigmund Freud and his school. With them he has in common the basic theory that many Märchen are an interpretation and reworking of dream experience in the light of a state of waking (pp. 5 and 43). His illustrations are frequently but not exclusively taken from Oriental literatures and Oriental collections of fairy tales. Appended to the work is a copious bibliography, in which, curiously enough, English works are altogether absent, with the exception of Miss Cox's *Cinderella* and Tawney's translation of Somadeva.

As a specialist in Oriental literatures Mr. Jacob is inclined to overrate, perhaps, the influence of the Orient on Western fiction and folklore; many of the resemblances and parallels in Mediaeval

Europe and the Near East adduced (pp. 8 ff.) doubtless deserve to be reëxamined. On p. 26 he rightly protests against the assumption that all fairy tales are derived from myths. But it seems questionable whether the Samson story originated in a nature myth as the author believes with the older school of mythologists (pp. 25-26). As has been pointed out by Sir J. G. Frazer,¹ the legend is based on the Märchen type of the External Soul (Life Index Motif). The sun myth in the Samson story (and its existence cannot be doubted in view of the proper names of hero and heroine) must then be secondary. A similar reservation must be made for the story of Adam and Eve, in which the author sees sex-psychological forces at work (p. 50). It cannot be doubted that the story in the form in which it entered the Old Testament canon contains such a sexual element; but at the same time it is safe to say that here again we have to deal with a secondary development. As a matter of fact, Sir J. G. Frazer convincingly proved with a wealth of material collected from all over the earth that the serpent owes its rôle in the Hebrew myth to the well-nigh universal belief in the immortality of serpents, a belief which is based upon the fact that serpents cast off their old skin.² Connected with this ancient belief is the wide-spread story of the animal messenger who either wilfully or by mistake deprives man of immortality, keeping it for himself.³ The tree of life and the tree of knowledge were originally the tree of life and the tree of death, and the cunning serpent persuaded poor Eve to eat of the latter, whereas he himself ate of the tree of life, thereby winning immortality. It is clear that the change of the tree of death into a tree of knowledge is connected with the intrusion of the sexual element in the story, and this change can have occurred only in a sufficiently sophisticated age, when the meaning of the old tale had been forgotten, an age impregnated with ascetic doctrines themselves foreign to Judaism.

The great rôle of dreams in the history of mankind is rightly insisted upon (p. 85). The derivation of Germanic *drauma* from *draugma* (p. 38) is therefore very doubtful, especially if we remember the part played by dreams in Old Norse literature, where

¹ Sir J. G. Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, London, 1918, II, 484.

² *Ibid.*, I, 49; Apollodorus, *The Library*, London, 1921, II, 44.

³ Frazer, *Folk-Lore*, I, 213; O. Dähnhardt, *Natursagen*, Leipzig, 1910, III, 22.

they are always an exact reflection of coming events. The peculiar lack of initiative which characterizes many Märchen heroes is owing to the absence of will in dreams (p. 48). However, the common desire for a *dolce far niente* would, I think, account for it in many cases.

The theme of a man being taken to another country or another world and spending there eventful years, only to find, upon his return, that but a few seconds have passed since his departure (pp. 69 f.) is a favorite mediæval motive, being found in the eleventh tale of Juan Manuel's *Conde Lucanor*, in two Icelandic stories of Jón Halldórsson,⁴ in the twenty-eighth story of the *Novellino* (ed. Biagi, p. 36), and in the Old Irish legend of Laegaire mac Aim-thainn's visit to the fairy realm of Mag Mell.⁵ It doubtless originated with dream experience. But the same cannot be said in regard to the other motive where the hero, upon his return from the other world, finds his generation dead and gone and himself an old man, though he thought he had spent but a short time, generally a few hours, in the abode of bliss (p. 72). This motive is not usually found in dream experience; it is rather based on the notion that time flies in the happy spirit land by analogy with the rare hours of happiness here on earth, and few will contend, I believe, that the idea of the happy Otherworld, and hence all higher forms of religion, are derived from dream experience alone.

For the motive of the *Schwabenstreich* in Uhland's *Schwäbische Kunde* it is unnecessary to assume Oriental sources (p. 91); it occurs rather frequently in mediæval chronicles and works of fiction,⁶ also in folktales.⁷

⁴ H. Gering, *Islendzk Aeventyri*, Halle, 1882, I, 227 and 256.

⁵ A. Nutt, *The Voyage of Bran*, London, 1895, I, 180 ff.

⁶ Guil. Malm. I. IV, cap. 2, A. D. 1100. *Roland*, II. 1133-5; 1325-34, 1370-5, 1584-9, 1644-50. *Voy. de Charlemagne*, ed. Koschwitz, II. 453-464. *Gormand et Isembard*, cf. R. Zenker, *Das Epos von Isembard und Gormund*, Halle, 1896, p. 10. W. A. Clouston, *Popular Tales and Fictions*, Edinburgh, 1887, I, 42, *Þiðreks Saga*, ed. Unger, cap. 400. Cf. also the combat of Bardas Skleros with a Russian chief in G. Schlumberger, *L'Épopée byzantine à la fin du dixième siècle*, t. I, Paris, 1896, p. 55.

⁷ W. Hertz, *Deutsche Sage im Elsass*, Stuttgart, 1872, p. 277; K. Müllenhoff, *Sagen, Märchen und Lieder der Herzogtümer Schleswig-Holstein und Lauenburg*, Kiel, 1845, p. 29; F. S. Krauss, *Slavische Volksforschungen*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 363.

The author's illustrations might be profitably enlarged to broaden the basis of the inquiry. The best example in literature of the terrible resuscitation scene (p. 40) which is doubtless due to dream experience, is that of Schiller's *Räuber*, where it also assumes the form of a dream. A good illustration of skillful and accurate use of a dream in short story literature (p. 41) is *El Pajaro en la Nieve* by A. Palacio Valdés. There the blind boy experiences in a dream what constitutes his only hope, his brother's return. Of the woman's reaction against her own growing passion (pp. 49 ff.) Benavente's powerful play *La Mal Querida* furnishes a good example. The motive of the "double" (doubtless due to dream experience, as the author suggests, pp. 64 ff.) occurs in numerous devil stories⁸ and also in W. Hauff's *Die Memoiren des Satan*.

Among the Märchen which doubtless go back to dreams (p. 78) mention should be made of one occurring in one of the Oriental versions of the *Seven Sages*.⁹ There the hero, the servant of a number of one-eyed old men, opens a forbidden door, and is carried by a bird to a land of bliss where he marries the queen. Again he opens a forbidden door, and the same bird carries him back to the former place, there depriving him of one eye.

Among the instances of artistic inspiration through dreams (p. 94) the legend of Caedmon as told by Bede (*Hist. Eccl.*, 1. IV, cap. 24) should have been mentioned.

The book distinguishes itself by its neat appearance and faultless print—I have noticed just one misprint, on p. 17, where the reading should be *Bolte*. It is to be hoped that the following works of the series will come up to the same high standards.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

University of Minnesota.

⁸ *Am Ur-Quell*, IV (1893), p. 115.

⁹ It occurs in the *Seven Viziers* (v, 1). Cf. Clouston, *The Book of Sindibad* (1884), p. 17; *Popular Tales and Fictions*, I, 199; Benfey, *Pantschatantra*, Leipzig, 1859, I, 154; Nerucci, *Sessanta Novelle popolari montalesi*, Firenze, 1891, No. 9.

Maria Chapdelaine par LOUIS HEMON. Edited with introduction, notes, questionnaire, exercises, and vocabulary by HUGO P. THIEME. New York: Macmillan, 1923. xxviii + 262 pp.

Maria Chapdelaine is one of the best French novels written since Maupassant on French peasant life. It was called "roman exotique," "roman canadien," but in fact it is a product of the spirit of regionalism which, reacting against the crude materialism of Balzac's peasant figures and the prejudiced attacks of Zola on the farmer, has invaded the French novel. In one respect *Maria Chapdelaine* even surpasses Maupassant's stories: it completes the *œuvre* of Flaubert's greatest disciple whose inspiration was not strong enough to create, besides immortal anecdotes, a true epic of the French soil.

The moral elevation of Hémon's novel would make it excellent material for class use if obstacles of a serious nature did not present themselves. The editor mentions in his preface that "there was naturally a temptation to make a detailed study of Canadian French," but, and for good reason, "no attempt has been made to study even the essential characteristics of Canadian French." The editor's method is to translate "freely very unusual passages and all other matter is treated in the vocabulary." Outside of Anglicisms, archaic locutions, and archaic pronunciation Canadian French is not very divergent from certain Northern French dialects—especially that of Normandy—which have been often reproduced in French fiction. But in a school edition like this, if the "detailed" study of the dialect is omitted, at least specific Canadian and other dialectal locutions should have been very carefully noted either in the notes or in the vocabulary. It most certainly misleads the student if the vocabulary states without further explanation that "dépareillé" means "matchless," or gives without indicating their peculiarity words like "la boucane," "à la brunante," "la couverte"; "le coureur-des-bois," meaning "chasseur, trappeur," not "woodsman"; "cru," meaning "damp and cold"; "dépouillé," meaning "lifeless"; "disputer," which on the other side of the Ocean does not mean "to scold"; "faraud," according to Littré and Bescherelle "fat de mauvais ton," but in Canada "cavalier," while the vocabulary gives only the adjectival meaning which does not fit into the text; "gaudriole," not exactly "mixed grain," but

"bran mixed with water, a kind of fodder"; "gazette," antiquated in France, used only in certain traditional titles, as "Gazette de France, Gazette de Cologne"; "le godendard"; "l'habitant"; "la jarre," not "jar," but "small water barrel"; "approprié" for French "conforme, propre à la circonstance"; "ataca," "atteler," in the meaning of "harnacher." The editor might well have used one of the numerous Canadian-French dictionaries,—like that of Sylva Clapin, Montréal, 1894—and in that case he would have better translated "badrant," "bardasser," "boucane," "robe de carriole" and some of the vocables already quoted. The notes do not help the student much in understanding the text. Very often they show that the explanation was made at random:

Page 9: "Er" as form of address does not show "respect and reverence" in modern German, on the contrary! Page 31: "le sol canadien ne faisait que se débarrasser avec effort de son manteau d'hiver" does not mean "*only* with the greatest effort could rid itself of" but "*just* rid itself of. . . ." Page 59: The editor forgets that the definite article before "on" is not only "euphonic," but historical, too, and is used at the beginning of sentences, as well as in the combinations "si l'on, où l'on." Page 143: "je vas" is not colloquial, but a vulgarism, archaic and provincial. Page 144: "Eutrope prit dans une de ses poches et ouvrit lentement une petite boîte" is translated: ". . . *put his hand into one of his pockets*, took out and slowly opened, . . ." why the long circumlocution? Page 156: "vous avez-t-y" is not "colloquial," but vulgar; "c'est-y" is not "c'est," but "est-ce?" In short, the notes are insufficient and the editor seldom distinguishes between Canadian and French usage.

The French of the exercises and questionnaires added to the novel is far from being irreproachable: "imitez leur conversation" for "répétez . . ."; "que voulait . . . ne pas permettre," for "que ne voulait-il pas permettre" (185); "le nom Charles Eugène" for "le nom de Charles Eugène" (186); "le soir de rentrée de Maria" for "le soir de la rentrée de Maria" (187); "rester" for "demeurer, vivre"; "la condition du climat" for "les conditions du climat"; "quand la fête de sainte Anne a-t-elle lieu" is incorrect—"une fête tombe" in French (189); "sugérer" meaning "proposer" is English or Canadian French (196); "quel fut l'effet de Lorenzo sur la compagnie" for "quelle

impression Lorenzo fit-il sur la compagnie" (197); "mettre une tentation devant quelqu'un" is not French (198); "rendez compte" for "racontez" (198); the editor forgets that there is no substantive like "avant-midi" in French (100) and vocabulary, it is Canadian; in literary French "matin, matinée" are the only words for "forenoon"; "que voulait dire la vie pour Maria" (201) is not French; "la réponse de la question" should be "la réponse à la question" (201); the words "incrédule" and "incroyable" are mixed in the question "quelle phrase trouve-t-elle un peu incrédule?" (196).

If we add that the vocabulary quotes "délíce" (sing.) as fem.; makes "pouce" fem. when meaning "inch"; translates "mesquin" by "trivial," does not distinguish between "poitrine" and "poitrail," explains "malavenant" by "malvenant" and "malvenu," that many a misprint disfigures the text and the vocabulary, we may state that there is great need for a new edition of this masterpiece.

Marquette University.

A. STEINER.

First Phonetic French Course. By CHURCHMAN and HACKER.
Heath and Co., 1923.

Those who are fervent believers in the teaching of phonetics, and their number is continually increasing, will welcome the appearance of this new little volume. Its authors have had long experience with the study of phonetics and I shall not attempt to analyze in detail their treatment of the subject. I should like to make a few remarks, wholly practical, concerning *method*.

The *First French Course* limits itself entirely to giving the text in phonetic symbols. Only in the vocabularies of its sixteen lessons do we see words in French spelling, and then in parentheses. So far so good. But how about the passing over to reading from standard spelling? I know that the enemies of the phonetic method have been objecting that the student makes a confusion of phonetic and standard spelling, that therein lies the great difficulty. I must say that in the few years of my experience with teaching phonetics I have perhaps had *two* cases of a student saying *le* (phonetic spelling) instead of *la* when confronted with the standard spelling *le*. This is about the extent of confusion I have

found in my own classes. On the contrary, the reading of a given text in phonetic spelling, mastering that text, then passing over to the *same* text in standard spelling, first with the phonetic text open beside the other, gives excellent results. The student finds added interest in his work when he can make the comparison between the two texts, he eagerly watches for all peculiarities, such as liaisons, denasalizing of vowels, the pronunciation of *d* as *t*, when linked, etc. Phonetic symbols then become something extremely alive, primarily important.

Perhaps, when teaching very young children, when there is plenty of time ahead, a primer in phonetic symbols only may be found perfectly satisfactory, and yet even under those circumstances I doubt the efficiency of such a method. No matter how scientific we should like to be, we must also think of the practical side of the question, of how to get the best results, of how to stimulate the interest of the pupil so as to accomplish those results.

Occasionally a student asks the following question at the very beginning of the first year French course: "What is the use of studying phonetic symbols, reading from phonetic texts when eventually we must naturally read from books in standard spelling?" That question is never asked after the first or second lesson, for the student then realizes the value of the phonetic text since it is compared immediately with the standard text. If, however, the student, at the beginning of his French instruction, is kept day after day to the phonetic text I am afraid his interest will lag, to say nothing of the fact that experience has proved that the best results are obtained only when the phonetic passage is followed by the reading of the same passage in the standard spelling. It seems to me that the volume in question would have much more practical value if the authors reproduced, either in an appendix or side by side with the phonetic transcription, the corresponding standard spelling of the same passage. More exercises such as those on page 18, *Common Phrases*, but with the standard spelling instead of the English translation, would be worth adding to the book.

The treatment of sounds is excellent. In such a comprehensive study it might be worth while saying something about the difference between French and English *p* and *b* for we all know that the difference is marked. But this is a minor detail.

Teachers College, Columbia University.

HÉLÈNE HARVITT.

CORRESPONDENCE

NOTES ON LILY'S *Euphues*

The following notes are offered as a supplement to the discussion of Lily's sources, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxiii, 334-42, xxxiv, 121-22. They are made with reference to two editions of the *Euphues* (by M. W. Croll, 1916, and R. W. Bond, 1902).

P. 38 (B. I, 204). "The stone of Sicilia, the which the more it is beaten, the harder it is." Cp., perhaps, Propertius, I, 16, 29, "sit licet et saxo patientior illa Sicano"—where the Latin allusion is about as obscure as Lily's.

P. 64 (B. I, 223). "If the fierce bull be tamed with the fig-tree." Add Pliny, *N. H.* xxiii, 64, 130, "caprificus tauros quamlibet feroces collo eorum circumdata in tantum mirabili natura compescit, ut immobiles praestet."

P. 109 (B. I, 258). "The fire-stone in Liguria . . . is kindled with water." Cp. Pliny, *N. H.* xxxvii, 7, 99, "Est et anthracitis . . . falsum arbitror quod et in Liguria nasci prodiderunt . . . aquis perfusae exardescunt."

P. 119 (B. I, 266). The "etymology of mother among the Grecians" should be printed "*meter a me terein*."

P. 120 (B. I, 267). "And be kept from barbarous talk as the ship from rocks." Cp., perhaps, Aulus Gellius, I, 10, "ut tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum."

P. 165 (B. I, 307). "Milo, that great wrestler began to weep when he saw his arms brawnfallen and weak, saying, 'Strength, strength is but vanity.' Helen, in her new glass viewing her old face, with a smiling countenance cried, 'Beauty, where is thy blaze?'" A Euphuistic paraphrase of Ovid, *Met.* xv, 229-33.

fletque Milon senior, cum spectat inanes
illos, qui fuerant solidorum mole tororum
Herculeis similes, fluidos pendere lacertos.
flet quoque, ut in speculo rugas aspexit aniles,
Tyndaris et secum, cur sit bis rapta, requirit.

P. 173 (B. I, 314). "Every place a country to a wise man." Add Seneca, *Ad Helviam*, ix, 7, "omnem locum sapienti viro patriam esse," and the saying of Theophrastus, Vitruvius, vi, praef., "doctum . . . in omni civitate esse civem."

P. 192 (B. II, 3). "The musician, who, being entreated, will scarce sing," etc. Cp. Horace, *Sat.* I, 3, 1-3, "Omnibus hoc vitium est cantoribus," etc.

Pp. 194, 277, 283 (B. II, 5, 73, 77). "The twins of Hippocrates." See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxviii, 313.

P. 226 (B. II, 31). "At thy coming into England be not too inquisitive of news, neither curious in matters of state." Cicero,

De Offic. I, 34, 125, "peregrini autem atque incolae officium est, nihil praeter suum negotium agere, nihil de alio inquirere minimeque esse in aliena re publica curiosum."

P. 325 (B. II, 111). "I am torn upon the wheel with Ixion, my liver gnawn of the vultures and harpies." A blend of the stories of Ixion and Tityos.

P. 373 (B. II, 152). "That none ought at any time so to love that he should find it in his heart at any time to hate." Cicero, *De Amic.* XVI, 59 (the saying attributed to Bias of Priene) "ita amare oportere, ut si aliquando esset osurus."

W. P. MUSTARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

UNPUBLISHED EPIGRAMS BY J. B. LULLY

The renowned musician J. B. Lully (1633-87) was, his Italian origin notwithstanding, occasionally guilty of an epigram or a song in French. Almost nothing of his verse has escaped destruction. The *Oeuvres de Chaulieu* (1777, II, p. 92) contain a *Couplet de Chanson de Lully pour Mlle de R . . .*, with a *Réponse Impromptu* by Chaulieu, in which Lully's moral character is not spared. His contemporary reputation as a libertine is further explained by the nature of some of his poems, printed by F. Lachèvre in his *Bibliogr. des Recueils coll.* (III, 429, 523). They are addressed to his friends Lachapelle and Saint Pavin and entirely in the habitual note of these "émules d'Anacréon."

"Le Florentin Jean-Baptiste Lully,
Que de Phébus conçut Dame Harmonie,
Pour les bons mots avoit tant de génie,
Que je voudrois en avoir recueilli
Des mieux choisis! A son compatriote
Le sale Pogge, il damoit le pion. . . ."
(Sénécé, *Le présent ruineux, Epigrammes et autres Pièces*, p. 189.)

A MS. *Recueil de Vaudevilles* of the end of the seventeenth century, in my possession, has preserved six epigrams by Lully, of which I print here five. I suppress the sixth, which rivals the *Chansons de Blot* in licentiousness.

Recueil de Vaudevilles, Vol. v, F. 145:

Sur Du Pontel par Lully.

Aimable Du Pontel,
Si les Dieux m'en croyoient, tu serois immortel:
Ganymède autrefois pour moins fut rendu tel.

Lully sur Ninon.

Trop aimable Ninon.

Vous avez trop d'esprit pour vouloir dire non,
Le plaisir du péché vaut mieux que le pardon.

Lully sur la Moreau qui faisoit Scilla dans l'Opéra de Galathée.

Vous savez bien Scilla,

La pomme que Paris à Venus présenta,
Elle eut esté pour vous, mais vous n'estiez pas là.

Le Même à la Duchesse de la Ferté.

Aimable la Ferté.

Qui vous voit un moment est pour jamais charmé,
Moy, qui suis Florentin, je change de costé.

Le Même à la Sublique, fameuse danseuse de l'Opéra.

Ah! Je vois dans vos yeux

Voltiger un enfant plus beau que tous les dieux:
Ne luy refusez rien et vous danserez mieux.

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

New York University.

GAUTIER, QUINET, AND THE NAME "MOB"

There are at least two places in the writings of Théophile Gautier where he applies the name "Mob" to a personification of death. Such is the interpretation that two American scholars give for this name. In publishing the poem *Vieux de la Vielle* (1850) in his *French Lyrics of the XIXth Century* (1913), Professor G. N. Henning makes this comment (p. 374), on line 28:

"Avec ses dents jaunes de tartre,
Son crâne de mousse verdi,
A Paris, boulevard Montmartre,
Mob se montrant en plein midi!

"Line 28. 'Mob': perhaps another form of 'Mab,' though Gautier's lugubrious figure hardly matches the tricksome fairy. In 'Jettatura,' ch. xi, Gautier uses 'Mob' as a synonym of 'Death'; probably so here also."

In Professor A. Schinz' edition of *Jettatura* (1856), dated 1900, a note to the same effect is given on p. 138, explaining this phrase from chap. xi: "C'est aux plus jeunes et aux plus belles que la vieille Mob en veut." "The old Mob = death" (p. 138).

This is the exact meaning of this word if Gautier alludes in these passages to one of the *dramatis personae* of Edgar Quinet's mystic prose-poem *Ahasvérus* (1833). During the third "journée," at the beginning of part II, Death is introduced as an actor in these words: "La Mort sous le nom de Mob, vieille femme qui se chauffe dans les cendres." After this introduction, "Mob" always plays her part in the drama under that name.

Ahasvérus is almost grotesquely romantic, and would not easily be forgotten by the author of *Les Jeunes-France* who was twenty-two when Quinet's "mystery" was published. Now, was the name "Mob" coined by Quinet; suggested perhaps by words like Job, mort, Mab, morgue or Moab? Had he heard of Shelley's *Queen Mab*, in which Ahasuerus also appears? Even after considerable searching, the word remains an enigma.

WILLIAM LEONARD SCHWARTZ.

Stanford University.

TWO BOOKS INSCRIBED BY ANATOLE FRANCE

The time is not far distant when every scattered idea from the pen of Anatole France will be collected and treasured. Admirers of the Dean of French prose writers will no doubt be interested in the following lines, in the handwriting of M. France, found upon the title pages of two first editions of his books, now in the Chapin collection of rare books in the Williams College Library.

On the title-page of *Le Puits de Sainte Claire*:

"Il est singulier mais juste de dire que la doctrine de Saint François d'Assise est la pure doctrine socialiste. Avant même la mort du délicieux Saint, il ne subsistait plus rien de son œuvre. L'esprit en était changé.

Juillet, 1902."

On the title-page of *Pierre Nozière*:

"Pour Monsieur James Yung" (James Carleton Young? Anatole France does not know English, and seems to be somewhat proud of the fact)

"L'avenir est un lieu commode pour y mettre des songes. C'est là, comme en Utopie, que le sage se plaît à bâtir. Je veux croire que les peuples se feront un jour de paisibles vertus."

Gustave Michaut, who has found pleasure (and some success) in pointing out repetitions in the work of Anatole France would, I think, have some difficulty in finding this idea expressed by him in a similar form. The nearest parallel which I recall is the famous line from *Vers les Temps meilleurs*:

"Lentement, mais toujours, l'humanité réalise les rêves des sages."

DAVID C. CABEEN.

Williams College.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *l'Elève de Terpsicore*

It is pointed out in Professor Zeek's *Louis de Boissy*¹ that, although the authorship of *l'Elève de Terpsicore*,² published anonymously in 1718, has been generally ascribed to de Boissy, there has been considerable hesitancy in believing him to be the author. The evidence on each side is indicated, and an extract from the notes of the editor Prault is quoted, which apparently confirms the opinion that de Boissy did write this collection of satires.

Further support of this conclusion is furnished by a passage from an interesting brochure, printed early in the year after the publication of *l'Elève de Terpsicore*, entitled *Le Journal Satirique Intercepté*.³ It is especially to be noted that de Boissy is called "l'auteur" rather than "l'éditeur," a term applied to him by later literary historians.⁴ The passage in part is as follows: "Ce fut dans ce temps-là que M. l'Abbé de Boissy⁵—résolût de châtier ce satirique⁶ par une satire des plus galantes et des plus ingénieuses. C'est un petit livre en deux volumes intitulé *l'Elève de Terpsicore*. Il est vrai que l'auteur n'est point l'Abbé de Boissy, célèbre Docteur de Sorbonne, car il n'a pas encore vingt ans."⁷ Moreover, in 1724, he was called "ce Nourrisson de Terpsicore" in an epigram by Gacon.⁸

The evidence contained in these hitherto unnoticed passages is much earlier than any to which Professor Zeek refers, and establishes the fact that, in 1719—immediately after the appearance of the work—and also in 1724, de Boissy was known as its author.⁹

GEO. B. WATTS.

University of Minnesota.

¹ Grenoble, 1914, p. 222.

² *L'Elève de Terpsicore ou le Nourrisson de la Satire*, Amsterdam, 1718.

³ Paris, 1719, p. 6. Concerning the authorship of this brochure see my article, "Voltaire's Change of Name," in *M. L. N.*, xxxviii, 329.

⁴ Michaud, *Biographie Universelle*, iv, 594; *La Grande Encyclopédie*, vii, 161; Vapereau, *Dict. Univ. des Litt.*, p. 290.

⁵ Before devoting himself to a literary career, de Boissy had studied for the ministry and had worn the cloth. This accounts for the use, by contemporaries, of the title "l'Abbé de Boissy." Cf. Zeek, *op. cit.*, p. 5; Voltaire, *Œuvres* (Moland), i, 300.

⁶ Gacon. In a later publication I intend to discuss the quarrel between de Boissy and Gacon.

⁷ In 1718 de Boissy was twenty-four. To distinguish Louis de Boissy from another, then famous, Abbé de Boissy, the author goes on to explain that the former, although young, had no less sense than the most famous doctors of the Sorbonne.

⁸ *Suite du Secrétaire du Parnasse*, Paris, 1724, p. 41.

⁹ For other early eighteenth century attributions of authorship to de Boissy, see Goujet, *Bibliothèque fr.*, iv, 130; v, 184.

AN EARLY SIXTEENTH-CENTURY CRITICAL TREATISE

The first item in a list of *Italian Critical Treatises of the Sixteenth Century* compiled by Mr. R. C. Williams (*Modern Language Notes*, xxxv, 506-507): 1522. Campiano, N. B., *In Artem poeticam Primordia*. Venetiis, may seem puzzling even to students of sixteenth-century criticism. Strictly speaking, this little treatise does not belong in that list, but it is sufficiently early and sufficiently interesting in itself to be identified and brought to the attention of scholars at large.

The title-page reads as follows: "F. Navseae Blancicampiani in artem poeticen, carminumque condendorum primordia. Eiusdem syntagma de conficiendis epistolis. (Colophon:) Impressum Venetiis per Gregorium de Gregoriis. Anno M.D.XXII. die XVI Maii." There are 115 sheets, numbered recto only, and one unnumbered sheet. There are copies in the British Museum (11312. aaa. 33), in Madrid (Biblioteca Nacional, R-18534), in Berlin (former Königlische Bibliothek, Berol. Xa. 921), and apparently also in Munich.

This little treatise is little known. Creizenach mentions it, but one will look vainly for it in Saintsbury or Spingarn or Borinski. The encyclopedic Grässe (v, 677) mentions it as published in Venice, 1522(?) and 1552, but I have found no trace of an edition of 1552, and this is probably a mistake. Grässe calls the author Friedrich Nausea, i. e., Eckel or Unrath, alias Grew or Grau, from Pleichfeld or Weissenfeld near Würzburg, hence Blancicampianus or Bianco-Campiano, and in Mr. Williams's list, N. B. Campiano! The year of his death is given, erroneously, as 1550. According to Jöcher (*Gelehrtenlexicon*), Nausea, doctor of theology and laws, secretary to Cardinal Campeggio, preacher at the Stiftskirche in Mainz, preacher and counselor to Emperor Ferdinand, finally in 1541 bishop of Vienna, died at a great age in 1552. Neither Jöcher nor Jöcher-Adelung mentions the *Primordia*. The *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* adds that Nausea studied in Leipzig, went as tutor of a young nobleman to Italy in 1518, and also that he composed in 1521-22 an art of poetry entitled *Syntagma de conficiendis epistolis*! He obtained his doctor's degree in 1523. More precisely, as Jos. Metzger, *Friedrich Nausea*, Regensburg, 1884, p. 18, declares, the *Primordia* were finished in Padua late in the autumn of the year 1521 during a convalescence. The young Bavarian (he speaks of "his prince," Duke William of Bavaria) mentions Baron Christophorus Schwartzenberg as his patron, and the *Primordia* are a bid for the favor of Cardinal Campeggio. It was a very interesting effort indeed, with an unmistakable stamp of originality at a time when that quality was

rare; he quotes Aristotle and Horace and, of course, the inevitable Donatus, but also Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio.

When our knowledge of early modern criticism has progressed somewhat further, when Kasenbort's *Dialogus*, the anonymous *Tractatulus* of 1500, Badius's *Prenotamenta*, and Faustus's *Libellus de comoedia* are better known, it will be interesting to situate the work of Nausea, friend and correspondent of Erasmus, among the critical efforts of the early sixteenth century.

JOSEPH E. GILLET.

Bryn Mawr College.

BRIEF MENTION

Good Speech. An Introduction to English Phonetics by Walter Ripman (pp. viii + 88. E. P. Dutton and Co., New York. 1924). This book of Mr. Ripman's is an attempt to present in popular style the elements of English phonetics. The author writes "down" to his readers throughout, sometimes, indeed, approaching the style of books written for small children. Thus, on p. 23 he tells us, "In the throat we have a very delicate apparatus, the *vocal chords*, which you cannot see with your mirror." From Mr. Ripman's *Preface* one would judge that his book was meant primarily for teachers in elementary schools, and for these it will doubtless be of some value, in England at least. Serious students of speech in this country will hardly find it particularly useful, since it was written for British readers and in its American edition has not been adapted in the slightest degree to American conditions.

A thoroughgoing consideration of the book under review would hardly be worth our while. I will therefore content myself with a short discussion of a few matters of detail. On p. 7 the author, after explaining that Standard English arose out of the London dialect, asks, "What forces have helped to spread it so widely?" His answer is a good example of what may be called the pedagogic fallacy. He says, "Much has been done by the great boarding schools for boys, taught by men of good family educated at one of the older Universities. Much is due to the great progress in the education of women." Etc., etc. These factors are hardly so important as the author believes. On p. 17, and again on p. 39, Mr. Ripman speaks of the two kinds of *l* in English; he distinguishes these as the "dark" and the "clear," as in *will* and *willing*. That there is a difference here, everyone will agree. But the difference is one of quantity rather than of quality. In both words the

l is velarized or "dark" but the velation naturally is easier to hear in *will*, where the [l] is long, than in *willing*, where it is short. On p. 19, line 25, for *or* read *of*. On p. 22 and elsewhere the author uses the unfortunate term "continuant" for those consonantal sounds to which I have given the name "strait." He tells us, "When the breath has to pass through a very narrow opening . . . we get a consonantal sound. This sound can be sustained as long as the breath lasts, and it is therefore called a *continuant*." But a "stop" too can be sustained as long as the breath lasts. On p. 27 we read that "[b, d, g] are often pronounced without any 'voice' like [p, t, k]. . ." This is true enough, but in all such cases the on- or off-glide is voiced, so that no confusion arises. On p. 28 we learn that the *p* of *empty* is mute. I must confess I always pronounce it, and my pronunciation is the only one given in the *NED*. On p. 40 the author equates the voiceless [j] in *hue* with the *ch* of German *ich*. I cannot agree to this identification. To my ear the English sound differs markedly from the German. The area of articulation is much greater in German than in English, and somewhat further forward. The articulation is looser, the amount of air released is much greater and the spread of tongue, so to speak, is far more pronounced. On p. 48 we learn that the *a* of *father* is not a back vowel. The author does not make it altogether clear just how he would classify the sound; presumably he would call it "mixed." Such heterodoxy is not in place in a popular book; it is sure to confuse the reader, at the very least, and will hardly be endorsed by many phoneticians. On p. 50 we are told that the distinction between such words as *morning* and *mourning*, *horse* and *hoarse*, is not made in standard speech. Yet in the *NED* a sharp distinction in pronunciation is made in all such cases. Mr. Ripman's dictum will certainly be accepted nowhere in America, not to speak of Scotland and Northern England, and such a dictum makes painfully apparent the narrowness and rigidity of the author's conception of standard speech. On p. 55 the word *honesty* is transliterated [ɔnəstɪ]. I should pronounce it rather [ɔnistɪ], and here again I find myself in agreement with the *NED*. On p. 56 we read that to stress *aristocrat* on the second syllable is as out of date as it would be to stress the *-co-* of *balcony*. As I have always pronounced *aristocrat* with the stress on the second syllable, I was somewhat astonished to learn how much behind the times I had always been. But upon looking the word up in the *NED* I was reassured to find that that authority, at least, recognizes my pronunciation.

K. M.

A Most Friendly Farewell to Sir Francis Drake by Henry Robarts. Transcribed with a short Introduction by E. M. Blackie, B. A. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1924). This volume is a reprint of the copy (one of two known copies in existence) in the Library of Lincoln Cathedral. It has been handsomely printed "under the supervision of Bruce Rogers"; the typography of the original pamphlet has been reproduced "as closely as modern types will permit."

To students the brief *Farewell*—the occasion of which was Drake's expedition to the West Indies in 1585—will perhaps be chiefly interesting for its meter, since the "rhyming farewells" in uninspired hexameters furnish another instance of the popularity of this metrical form in that age (cf. B. M. Hollowell, "The Elizabethan Hexametrists," *Philological Quarterly*, III (1924), 51 ff.). The diction offers nothing of unusual importance, though several archaic words occur. A good mediaeval touch is "that rare knight Sir Francis Drake."

E. P. K.

NECROLOGY

It is with a keen sense of personal loss that the Editors of *Modern Language Notes* record the death of Professor Henry Alfred Todd of Columbia University on Saturday, January 3, 1925, in New York City. An associate editor of the *Notes* for fifteen years, from their inception in 1886 until 1900, he contributed to them, particularly during the period of his connection with Johns Hopkins University, ending in 1891, a large number of valuable articles. These include original studies on topics chiefly relating to Old French literature, as well as competent reviews of books on an extensive variety of topics—Spanish, Provençal, Italian, modern French literature, palæography, etc., besides the fields of Old French linguistics and literature, in which he was more particularly interested. His articles were always pleasantly and at times brilliantly written. An extended sketch of his work will be published by Professor J. L. Gerig in the January-March number of the *Romanic Review*, of which Professor Todd was one of the founders. American scholarship has lost in him its first editor of Old French texts, and one of the most able and prolific of such workers, a syntactician of thorough preparation and useful activity, a linguist of broad attainments and wide sympathies, an inspiring teacher and a lovable personality.
